

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 31, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, who hast the words of eternal life and the hope of the world, let us be reassured of Thy guidance that we may carry truth and right to their best results; so do Thou inspire us with faith and zeal. Let daily discipline develop in us splendid qualities of manly character. May we invite every prospect that makes life worth living. By the remedy of superior law, practical righteousness, noble philanthropy, intellectual and spiritual education may we help make it difficult for evil to survive. O Lord, help us to seek first and always the kingdom of righteousness. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

REFERENCE OF H. R. 7694.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 7694 be rereferred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. This is done with the consent of the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to be rereferred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for unanimous consent that all ex-service Members of the House shall be permitted to have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record touching the adjusted compensation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that all ex-service Members have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the adjusted compensation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on account of the absence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Begg] I shall be obliged to object.

The SPEAKER. To-day is set apart for the consideration of business pertaining to the District of Columbia—

ELECTION CASE, ANSORGE V. WELLER.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from Committee on Elections No. 1.

The SPEAKER. For immediate consideration?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 242.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March, 1924.

Mr. COLE of Ohio submitted the following report from Committee on Elections No. 1:

The Committee on Elections No. 1, to which was referred the contested-election case of Martin C. Anson, contestant, v. Royal H. Weller, contestee, from the twenty-first district of the State of New York, respectfully reports to the House the following resolution, approved by said committee, for the approval and adoption by the House, with the recommendation that it do pass:

Resolved, That John Voorhis, Charles E. Heydt, James Kane, and Jacob Livingston, constituting the board of elections of the city of New York, State of New York, their deputies or representatives be, and they are hereby, ordered to appear by one of the members, the deputy or representative, before Elections Committee No. 1 of the House of Representatives forthwith, then and there to testify before said committee, or a subcommittee thereof, in the contested-election case of Martin C. Anson, contestant, v. Royal H. Weller, contestee, now pending before said committee for investigation and report; and that said board of elections bring with them all the disputed ballots, marked as exhibits, cast in every election district at the general election held in the twenty-first congressional district of the State of New York on November 7, 1922. That said ballots be brought to be examined and counted by and under the authority of said Committee on Elections in said case, and to that end that the proper subpoena be issued to the Sergeant at Arms of this House, commanding him to summon said board of elections, a member thereof, or its deputy or representative, to appear with such ballots as a witness in said case; and that the expense of said witness or witnesses, and all other expenses under this resolution, shall be paid

out of the contingent fund of the House; and that said committee be, and hereby is, empowered to send for all other persons or papers as it may find necessary for the proper determination of said controversy; and also be, and it is, empowered to select a subcommittee to take the evidence and count said ballots or votes and report same to Committee on Elections No. 1, under such regulations as shall be prescribed for that purpose; and that the aforesaid expense be paid on the requisition of the chairman of said committee after the auditing and allowances thereof by said Committee on Elections No. 1.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a question on this resolution?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand this resolution is reported from Committee on Elections No. 1, and it proposes to send for a certain number of ballots that the committee desires to examine in connection with the contest of Anson against Weller?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the resolution state the number of ballots?

Mr. DALLINGER. No; it says the disputed ballots, which are marked as exhibits in this case.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, it has come to me in some way there are substantially about 820 of these ballots?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes; 820. For the information of the gentleman from Tennessee I wish to call his attention to the contestee's brief, at the top of page 55, where the contestee makes this statement:

The contestant makes no attempt to discuss these exhibits of ballots, although it is apparent that in this closely contested election the true result is to be found there.

Now, each party contends that if the 820 disputed ballots are counted according to the statutes and decisions of the State of New York he will be found to be entitled to the seat. Now, the committee felt that the short cut in this case is to send for these disputed ballots, because an examination of them might decide the whole question; and it certainly would not be necessary to send for any other ballots if the committee should find that Mr. Weller, the contestee, was entitled to the seat.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman I am not familiar with what has developed before the committee, but it has been suggested to me that possibly after an examination of these ballots the situation might be developed that would render necessary the sending for additional ballots. Now, I do not know about that, but I assume that if such a situation should arise upon the demand of either party that the committee will be favorable to sending for the remainder of the ballots?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly, if it should be found necessary.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Now, one other thing, if I may ask the gentleman. I have a wire from one of the contestee's counsel who is very much interested in the time when this subpoena shall be returnable. Of course, that is not a matter for the House to determine, but is a matter to be determined by the Committee on Elections No. 1 when they come to the issuance of the subpoena, but I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, it will be agreeable for the return date to be fixed not earlier than April 18?

Mr. DALLINGER. I understand that it is the hearing that they want not earlier than the 18th; I think the return date ought to be a little earlier than that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No. The suggestion in this telegram is this—this is from Mr. Saxe, of counsel for the contestee:

No objection to Cole resolution as to form.

That is the resolution referred to. Then, further—

Subpoenas must bear some return date. If resolution should be amended to include a date—

Of course there is no necessity of trying to fix the date here, because the committee will fix it—

Please urge date not earlier than April 18. Board of elections will need that time to go with counsel to various police precincts and pick out over 800 ballots inclosed in 376 boxes and envelopes. Time also necessary for me to examine record and work sheets as to these exhibits.

Mr. DALLINGER. I agree to have the return date fixed as April 18 on the understanding that the hearings may be held on the same date.

I do not want to put off this case any longer than possible, because it may take a good deal of time yet.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I know of no disposition to delay it beyond that time.

Mr. DALLINGER. I am perfectly willing to agree to have the return date not earlier than April 18.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Does this resolution provide for an unlimited expenditure from the contingent fund, or is it in the control of the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. DALLINGER. This is in the same form as other resolutions of this kind.

Mr. MACGREGOR. What is the expenditure?

Mr. DALLINGER. I do not know. It will not be very large.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY.

The SPEAKER. This is District day.

PREVENTION OF VENEREAL DISEASES.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 491.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have been informed—I do not know how correctly—that there is very strong opposition to this bill, and that if it is brought up now for consideration the rest of the day may be consumed in its consideration, thereby side-tracking several bills which I understand are of very great importance to the District. Would the gentleman think that possibly under those circumstances it might be wise to consider some other bill?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that this bill is the unfinished business before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. We had this bill before the House at the last session, and we hoped to dispose of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. General debate has been completed on this bill, and the bill has been partially read under the five-minute rule, although most of the time expected to be consumed on it has been consumed already. I think this bill could be finished in 20 minutes. If the membership are not in favor of it, they will have a chance to kill it, or if they favor it they will have a chance to pass it. All the preliminaries are out of the way.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman from Texas seems to overlook the fact that there are 21 sections in the bill, covering 8 pages, and that the bill has not been carefully gone over by the committee, and that we have not a single committee amendment. The bill in its present form, although it purports to relate to the District of Columbia, in fact covers the whole United States, and if changed so as to apply only to the District of Columbia numerous amendments will have to be made. I assume that the gentleman from Texas, being engaged in other matters for the District, has not used his usual care in scrutinizing the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say to the gentleman that we have had this bill before us for three years, and it met with the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Did the gentleman intend that it should apply to the entire United States?

Mr. BLANTON. No.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Well, it does.

Mr. BLANTON. If it does, the gentleman from Indiana could straighten it out in about two minutes if he uses his usual agility in straightening it out.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think if this bill is going to take a long time and be seriously opposed, it would be wise to consider some other bill.

Mr. BLANTON. This legislation has been considered carefully for three years. It has been thrashed out in committee.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. And it appears now without a single committee amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. It was the least drastic bill that has been pending before the committee on that subject.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The committee recommended the reporting of the bill and we reintroduced it. I have no objection, however, to its going back, but I would not suggest anything of that kind.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Ohio intimate to us when he will have another District day?

Mr. LONGWORTH. A good deal depends upon what happens to the bills brought in by the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman from Ohio allow us to have a night session to-night on this Gilbert bill?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think we ought to have night sessions on bills of this kind. I am willing to have night sessions at any time the House desires it on private bills and bills of that nature, but it would be impossible to keep a quorum here at a night session to consider bills of this kind.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to demand the regular order at this time?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then I demand the regular order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am afraid that this will result in a waste of time.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is the motion of the gentleman from Maryland, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 491. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 491, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, when the committee rose on the last District day we were engaged in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. A part of the bill before the House having been read is it not in order to continue the reading of the bill?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that at the time the committee rose we had just taken a vote to strike out the enacting clause and upon that vote a quorum did not vote and a quorum was not present. Therefore the immediate matter before the committee would be a vote on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I differ from the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman is wrong about that. We voted and there was no question as to a quorum being present then and we proceeded to do business after that.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman from Texas is in error. I did not make the point of order, and I should not have made it. The motion was lost, and I was going to abide by it, but some gentleman on the other side made the point of no quorum.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. After the motion had been declared lost.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that the Chairman look at the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the question was put on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] to strike out the enacting clause; upon a division there were—ayes 10, noes 15. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] thereupon made the point of order that there was no quorum present. While the Chair was counting the gentleman from Georgia withdrew his point of order that there was no quorum present and asked for tellers. Thereupon the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] moved that the committee should rise, but the motion was rejected. Thereupon the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] renewed the point of order that there was no quorum present. The Chair counted and found there was no quorum present. Thereupon the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] moved that the



committee should rise, and the committee thereupon rose. It would appear to the Chair, therefore, that the vote upon the question to strike out the enacting clause was not completed.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that there was an intervening motion.

Mr. BLANTON. For tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that a demand for a vote by tellers had been made, and immediately the point of order of no quorum was made; that during the subsequent proceedings the committee rose, and no further action was taken upon the motion to strike out the enacting clause or to complete the vote upon that motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the motion to strike out the enacting clause is now pending before the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the membership present now is not the membership that was present at the time the motion was originally made, and that under the rules five minutes are allowed to a side on a motion to strike out the enacting clause, I ask unanimous consent that there be 10 minutes of debate, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] and 5 minutes to be controlled by myself.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think the unanimous-consent request is quite proper, but I doubt the advisability of giving all the time to the other side. The motion was mine.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that five minutes be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] and five minutes be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I believe I am the man who made the point of order that there was no quorum present. Therefore, I think I am entitled to ask the gentleman from Texas how he feels about the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] is against it.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. How is the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I am for the bill. It is a matter which the committee has considered for three years and there was not a vote in the committee offered against it. We have thrashed it out in the committee for three years.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Under the division of time, then, I assume you will have three speeches in favor of the bill and one against it—is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I have no objection to 10 minutes of debate, 5 minutes in favor of the bill and 5 minutes against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks unanimous consent that there be 10 minutes' debate upon the question to strike out the enacting clause, 5 minutes of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] and 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS]. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I want to get some information. The debate on this proposition is now closed, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted.

Mr. WINGO. Well, frankly, I am interested in knowing whether or not you are going to get up the school-teachers' bill to-day or not, or are you going to piddle along on something else?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course the Chair can not advise the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. I want to ask that of the gentlemen who are in charge and who are responsible. Are you going to keep this bill before the committee all day as a buffer, or are you going to really get up the teachers' bill? If you are not going to get up the school-teachers' bill to-day, why not say so?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that the ranking members of the committee met with the majority leader and submitted the program for the day, and it is proposed to take up this bill which is before the committee.

Then a bill closing certain streets and alleys through the Walter Reed Hospital reservation, a bill relating to capital punishment in the District of Columbia, and then the school-teachers' salary bill. That is the program that was agreed upon by the majority and minority members of the committee.

Mr. WINGO. Upon the basis of that statement, does not the gentleman feel like making the statement now to the House, based upon our experience for two years on this question of pay of school-teachers, that the gentleman does not expect the school-teachers' bill to come up to-day?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I could not answer that question.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; the gentleman can answer whether he expects it to come up.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I had hoped to get the school-teachers' bill before the House as the unfinished business and keep it before the House, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. This is the same situation we have had in reference to this bill for nearly two years.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state to the gentleman from Arkansas, as one member of the District Committee, I am in favor of getting up the teachers' bill now.

Mr. WINGO. Everybody seems to be in favor of getting it up, but I have not had a chance to vote on it for two years. I think this same explanation has been made to me four times in the last 12 months.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that my motion to strike out the enacting clause of this bill is pending and I want to say to the other members of the committee that if that motion shall carry, when it is reported back to the House, I shall offer a preferential motion to recommit the bill to the committee, for the reason that I am not opposed to legislation upon this subject, but if the gentleman from Arkansas will study this bill the gentleman will understand that this bill can not be written on the floor in a way to cure all the defects in it.

Mr. WINGO. I have not even read the bill and I have no interest in it, either personal, political, or professional. I am thinking about the school teachers' bill and I am interested in what I fear is a continuation of what we have seen during the last Congress and that you are going to dilly-dally along and the school teachers' bill will be shunted off, with everybody for it, and never passed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the request of the gentleman from Texas that there be 10 minutes' further debate on the motion to strike out the enacting clause of the pending bill, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the committee, and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS]. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Being opposed to any further delay, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to strike out the enacting clause of the bill H. R. 491.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SANDERS of Indiana) there were—ayes 40, noes 30.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SANDERS of Indiana and Mr. BLANTON.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 42, noes 70.

So the motion to strike out the enacting clause was rejected.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 491 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SALARIES OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL OFFICERS.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6721, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes, and pending that motion I want to see if we can not reach an agreement as to time. I ask that general debate on this bill be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the other by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6721, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6721, to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity of speaking in favor of the bill now before the House providing for an increase in the pay of school officials and teachers, and to provide for a reorganization of the school system for the District of Columbia.

Nothing we can do will more materially benefit the citizens of the District and their children than the passage of this legislation, which is a long-deserved recognition of the high profession of educators, and which will do much to elevate the standard and provide elementary education to the great mass of children of the District.

The development of the public-school system in this country is one of the most interesting phases of our national life. In the beginning we find there were three types of schools in America. First, what was known as the town teacher; and each municipality had its own instructor in the arts of reading and writing, for the first purpose of this law which was enacted in New England was to enable the people to learn to read the Scriptures. A teacher was appointed and the course of study directed by the Puritan Church. It was a form of town school, but under church direction.

The second type of school was the parochial school prevalent in Pennsylvania, Dutch New York and New Jersey, and Maryland. In each of these States each church established a school in each church parish. The teachers were usually the clergymen of the parish. In the larger towns private pay schools and what were known as "charity schools" were founded. The great State of Pennsylvania held to this form of education until 1834, and it was then only overcome after bitter opposition.

The third type of school was the so-called "pauper school" and the "non-State interfering school" of Virginia and the South. Out of these grew the pay schools and in the larger towns and cities in addition a more elaborate form of "charity school."

In 1801 in New York there was founded the first "free school for poor white children whose parents belong to no religious society, and who for some reason can not be admitted to other charity schools." Afterwards there was founded the famous Public School Society of New York, "for the children of poor parents and for orphans." In Baltimore there was founded in 1799, "The Benevolent Society of the City of Baltimore for the education of the female poor," and a year later the "Male Free Society of Baltimore."

The District of Columbia, too, had "public schools," which were schools "for the poor who must show that they can not pay for their learning." These schools were organized here in 1804 by gifts from public spirited citizens, including Thomas Jefferson, who gave \$200 to the cause and was the president of the first governing board. These institutions remained "pauper schools" until 1844.

The need for more general dissemination of knowledge awoke public opinion to the necessity of real development of citizens; the necessity of training for citizenship; the urgent need of the removal of the forms of class distinction and caste formation as was produced by such a system of education.

The awakening and arousing of public sentiment was taken up by the labor organizations and institutions, and public schools became established throughout New England, yet there were in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Virginia, and the South the so-called "charity schools." In 1833 it was estimated that 1,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 15 were not attending school.

Not only were the facilities for free education not provided but parents who were capable of giving their children elementary training of an educational character were deprived of that opportunity by employers—threats were made that if the children were taken from the workshop the parents must leave the employment, and these threats were often put into execution.

Early in 1832 there was formed the New England Association of Farmers and Mechanics, and at its convention held in

this year they made the education of children in manufacturing districts the principal business of the gathering. From this beginning grew a mighty sentiment for "education of all people as prescribed by the convention of 1832."

During that early period every candidate of the workingmen's party was pledged to favor a general system of State education. The campaign for a public-school system was vigorously prosecuted and pulpit and press were urged to press the vital need of public education.

About this time there began the first agitation in America for a system of compulsory education, and it was urged at that time that an inheritance tax be levied along with a land tax in order to support a system of compulsory education. The workingmen of that day urged free education on the ground of equality, and many leaders of that day devoted themselves entirely to the adoption of a system of public education.

Next was taken up the campaign for free textbooks, now adopted as a part of the public-school system of most of the States of the Union. It has been shown that only one-third of the children in our public schools complete the grammar-school course and less than 10 per cent finish high school. In four large industrial towns, according to figures presented by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, more than 75 per cent of the children quit school before reaching the seventh grade.

It is therefore with pleasure that I present as acting chairman of the committee the present school teachers' salary bill. For two years I have worked with other members of the committee to secure the enactment of this legislation.

The bill as originally introduced was not satisfactory to the teachers, and feeling that a bill purporting to help the teachers should in reality do so, I framed some amendments to the bill last year and was successful in having them adopted by the entire District Committee.

These amendments, which give the teachers an increase in pay, an equitable place in the salary schedule, and just recognition for professional services already rendered, have been incorporated in this measure.

The bill as amended has met with the approval of the Board of Education, and is satisfactory to the school officials and school-teachers.

I have some pride in having helped to make this measure a general measure affecting and benefiting every grade and branch of the school system of the District of Columbia.

I am intensely interested in education, especially in the primary grades, for this is the only method by which we can hope to elevate the standards of citizenship in this country, and the most fundamental consideration in any democratic community is a well-organized and well-paid public school system.

I am a firm believer in "Education for democracy, democracy in education." It is for this reason that I have favored the various measures before us looking to the development of a constructive school system, and this bill is a vital part of such a program. It is universally admitted that the standard of a school system is determined by the quality of its teaching, and we can not expect to have highly trained men and women to be attracted to the work in which the entrance salary is too low. Nor can we expect them to remain—to decide to make this all-important profession a life's work if they are not after some years of successful teaching to receive a salary comparable with those paid in other lines of endeavor.

The men and women in this profession are rendering a service of the highest importance in this community, and they should receive a remuneration commensurate with their services.

The public is coming more and more to realize the need and the worth of paying them a decent wage.

This bill provides for the grade teacher, who before she receives her permanent appointment must have completed a four-year high-school course, a two-year normal-school course, and have taught one year on probation; it gives to her an entrance salary of \$1,400, and permits her, after eight years of successful teaching, to receive a salary of \$2,200.

To the high and normal school teacher, who before her permanent appointment must have completed a four-year high-school course, a four-year college course, and passed a difficult entrance examination, and have taught one year on probation—for them there is provided an entrance salary of \$1,800, and enables her after 10 years of successful teaching to receive the maximum salary of \$2,800.

This bill legalizes and establishes by permanent law certain features of the school system which at present are being conducted through authority of the annual appropriation as carried



in the District of Columbia appropriation bill. It legalizes and authorizes the Junior High School, which everyone recognizes as a great need for children between the lower grades and the high-school classes.

The school for teaching Americanization, which is doing such a splendid constructive work in Washington, is here given a real legal status.

In its entirety it is a constructive piece of legislation, designed to help the teacher and the entire community, and I strongly urge its adoption by the membership of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT].

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, the public schools of the District of Columbia are organized, controlled, and operated under the provisions of an act of Congress approved June 20, 1906. A few amendments carried in appropriations bills have been put into effect since 1906, but no comprehensive legislation affecting the salaries of teachers has been enacted since 1906. The increases in salaries that have been granted from time to time to the employees of the board of education by successive appropriation acts have been of a temporary and limited nature.

The Committee on the District of Columbia is convinced that there is urgent need that the salary schedule thus authorized in appropriations bills should be revised, extended, and made more permanent. This new legislation is needed not only to bring assurance to those teachers now in the service, but to attract teachers of high qualifications to the Capital City where there has been a shortage of teachers because of inadequate salaries.

There have been many developments and a considerable extension of activities in the school system since 1906 in so far as the limitations of the old law would permit such changes. In order to stabilize what has been accomplished, and in order to make possible additional improvements in the public schools, this bill carries legislative authorization as follows:

1. It legalizes and renders more permanent the salaries of employees.

2. It authorizes and provides salaries for activities and positions which have developed in the public schools since 1906, such as junior high schools, vacation schools, community centers, administrative principals and assistant principals in high schools.

3. It abolishes "session room pay" and provides a better method of paying principals of elementary schools.

4. It also abolishes the classification of the elementary teachers into five salary groups, and provides a uniform basic salary with annual \$100 increments for a limited number of years.

5. It authorizes the employment of temporary teachers and the appointment of annual substitute teachers.

The report of the subcommittee on schools and playgrounds of the House of Representatives and the Senate, submitted to the Senate by Senator CAPPER, indorses and recommends the passage of a teachers' salary bill. This salary legislation undoubtedly represents one of the most urgent needs of the public-school system of the District of Columbia. This salary legislation will in no way interfere with the enactment of any other legislation suggested, supported, or recommended by committees of Congress in Senator CAPPER's report. On the contrary, this legislation should be viewed as the first legislation looking toward reorganization and rehabilitation of the school system of Washington. This salary bill has been prepared with the expectation that subsequent legislation affecting the general organization of the school system will follow.

#### NECESSITY FOR PASSING THIS BILL AT ONCE.

The public-school teachers of the District of Columbia are in a precarious position with regard to their salaries if this bill is not enacted into law before next July 1. These teachers employed as they are in the Federal District have received the annual bonus of \$240 along with the Federal employees. The Federal employees have been provided for in the recent reclassification legislation, and there is not likely to be any legislation before Congress this session with respect to continuing the bonus. The teachers are facing an actual loss of salary if this bill does not pass at this session of Congress.

This bill provides for only the educational employees of the Board of Education. This act does not carry salary-adjustment provisions for the following groups of employees: Clerks and stenographers, medical inspectors, dental inspectors, school nurses, engineers, janitors and other custodial positions. All such employees have been provided for in the reclassification legislation. Teachers are correspondingly provided for in this salary bill.

The policemen and the firemen of the District of Columbia were confronted with the same situation that now confronts the teachers. They were threatened with an actual loss of salary through discontinuance of the bonus. The House has passed a salary bill which has covered in the bonus of \$240 which the police and firemen enjoyed annually and has granted them an increase that is not incompatible with the provisions of the reclassification act granting increases to Federal employees.

This bill provides similarly for the teachers. In it they are safeguarded against the loss of the bonus, they are given the longevity increase in pay they have earned under the provisions of the present law, and they are given a reasonable increase in salary corresponding to the increase granted to Federal employees.

#### COST OF TEACHERS' SALARY LEGISLATION.

In this time of financial economy the cost of enacting this legislation is a major consideration for Congress. It may be presumed that the enactment of this legislation for the extension and improvement of the public-school service will increase expenditures for public education in Washington.

Before taking up the detailed cost of this proposed legislation it will be appropriate to consider the present cost of education in the District of Columbia as compared with the cost of public education in other cities.

#### PER CAPITA COSTS IN CITY SCHOOLS.

Statistical circular, No. 1, issued by the Bureau of Education of the Department of the Interior, on January 1, 1923, contains an analysis of the current expenses per student in average daily attendance in 170 city school systems. This information is for the school year 1921-22, and cities are arranged in groups according to the population of the cities. While the statistics for Washington were not included in the original leaflet, they have been subsequently computed by the Bureau of Education.

#### CITIES WITH OVER 100,000 POPULATION.

These tables show that among the 31 cities with a population of 100,000 or over included in this tabulation, Washington stands twenty-second from the top in the amount of money expended per pupil in her public schools. There are 21 cities that expend more per pupil than Washington for public education and 9 cities only pay less. The per capita cost of current expenses in Washington is \$77.69. At the head of the list of cities with 100,000 population or more stands Yonkers, N. Y., with an expenditure of \$121.60 per pupil. Other of the larger cities are: Springfield, Mass., \$118.90; Buffalo, \$116.60; Newark, N. J., \$110.89; Oakland, Calif., \$104.15; Boston, \$103.89; Detroit, \$102.95; San Francisco, \$94.59; Chicago, \$89.40; St. Louis, \$87.85; Minneapolis, \$84.52.

The complete information for the 31 cities of 100,000 population or over is contained in the following table:

#### Total current expenses per pupil.

Yonkers, N. Y.	\$121.60
Springfield, Mass.	118.90
Buffalo, N. Y.	116.60
Newark, N. J.	110.89
Oakland, Calif.	104.15
Boston, Mass.	103.89
Grand Rapids, Mich.	103.76
Detroit, Mich.	102.95
Albany, N. Y.	98.85
Spokane, Wash.	96.50
San Francisco, Calif.	94.59
Milwaukee, Wis.	92.69
Paterson, N. J.	89.51
Chicago, Ill.	89.40
St. Louis, Mo.	87.85
Dayton, Ohio	86.75
Camden, N. J.	85.62
Minneapolis, Minn.	84.52
New Bedford, Mass.	82.53
Fall River, Mass.	80.32
Providence, R. I.	79.95
Washington, D. C.	77.69
Philadelphia, Pa.	75.51
New Haven, Conn.	71.56
Scranton, Pa.	71.31
Louisville, Ky.	69.99
Reading, Pa.	61.51
San Antonio, Tex.	55.83
Atlanta, Ga.	51.74
Birmingham, Ala.	45.54
Nashville, Tenn.	34.63

On the basis of the per capita cost of instruction in the cities comparable in size with Washington, it is apparent that not enough money is now being expended for public education in Washington if Congress expects the Nation's Capital to take her rightful place educationally among the cities of her population class.

## CITIES OF 30,000 TO 100,000 POPULATION.

There are many cities in the country with a population of from 30,000 to 100,000 people that are paying more for public education than is paid in the Nation's Capital. If Washington be compared with the 40 cities reported in this document, issued by the United States Bureau of Education, that comparison will show that 26 of these cities are now paying more per pupil for public education than Washington is paying and 14 only are paying less. In this group of 40 cities, 9 cities are paying more than \$100 per pupil for public education as compared with \$77.69 expended in Washington. The following is a list of such cities with the per capita expended for current expenses in each city:

Total current expenses per pupil.	
Muncie, Ind.	\$129.67
San Diego, Calif.	113.05
Hamtramck, Mich.	112.54
Duluth, Minn.	108.88
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	106.18
Stockton, Calif.	105.56
Topeka, Kans.	102.04
Terre Haute, Ind.	100.85
Fort Wayne, Ind.	100.39
Rockford, Ill.	99.97
San Jose, Calif.	95.11
Oshkosh, Wis.	94.24
Utica, N. Y.	94.09
Meriden, Conn.	92.44
Chester, Pa.	91.51
Wheeling, W. Va.	91.25
Auburn, N. Y.	90.88
Joliet, Ill.	90.87
Waterbury, Conn.	90.76
Lorain, Ohio.	89.22
Tacoma, Wash.	87.67
Passaic, N. J.	84.81
Moline, Ill.	80.23
Green Bay, Wis.	79.48
Pittsfield, Mass.	79.44
Manchester, N. H.	79.04
Washington, D. C.	77.69
West Hoboken, N. J.	76.74
Newburgh, N. Y.	73.37
Quincy, Mass.	72.60
Taunton, Mass.	71.95
Perth Amboy, N. J.	67.12
York, Pa.	63.02
Hazleton, Pa.	62.47
Covington, Ky.	58.24
Danville, Ill.	51.06
Austin, Tex.	49.75
Wilmington, N. C.	49.29
Tampa, Fla.	42.31
Columbus, Ga.	35.78
Montgomery, Ala.	31.82

## CITIES OF 10,000 TO 30,000 POPULATION.

Fifty cities with a population of from 10,000 to 30,000 people are reported in this leaflet. If Washington be compared with these cities it will be found that 21 cities are paying more than Washington is paying and 29 of these smaller cities are paying less. The complete information for the 50 cities of from 10,000 to 30,000 population is contained in the following table:

Total current expenses per pupil.	
Bloomfield, N. J.	\$109.06
Missoula, Mont.	105.55
Eureka, Calif.	100.84
Santa Cruz, Calif.	97.60
Plainfield, N. J.	96.62
Concord, N. H.	96.17
Grand Forks, N. Dak.	96.16
Huntington, Ind.	92.69
Astoria, Oreg.	90.96
Beloit, Wis.	90.94
Walla Walla, Wash.	89.58
Parkersburg, W. Va.	87.86
Janesville, Wis.	87.48
Dunkirk, N. Y.	86.89
Calumet, Mich.	83.85
Morgantown, W. Va.	83.85
Galesburg, Ill.	81.06
Sanford, Me.	80.57
Independence, Kans.	80.22
Aberdeen, Wash.	79.96
Keokuk, Iowa.	79.80
Washington, D. C.	77.69
Danbury, Conn.	77.56
Oneonta, N. Y.	76.60
Watertown, Mass.	76.48
Greenfield, Mass.	76.34
Nashua, N. H.	74.29
Clinton, Mass.	73.11
Urbana, Ill.	72.99
Johnstown, N. Y.	71.35
Norwich, Conn.	71.06
Leavenworth, Kans.	70.86
Ottumwa, Iowa.	70.62
Freeport, Ill.	74.33
Glendale, Calif.	69.48
Holland, Mich.	67.55
Enfield, Conn.	64.11
New Albany, Ind.	62.42
Columbia, Mo.	61.89
Lebanon, Pa.	61.77
Butler, Pa.	61.03
Carthage, Mo.	60.03

Fort Smith, Ark.	\$50.92
Enid, Okla.	56.16
Jeffersonville, Ind.	53.89
Chicago Heights, Ill.	52.35
Owensboro, Ky.	48.24
Marshall, Tex.	41.94
Bessemer, Ala.	31.26
Rome, Ga.	31.13
Gadsden, Ala.	30.79

## CITIES OF FROM 5,000 TO 10,000 POPULATION.

Of the 50 cities with a population of from 5,000 to 10,000 people, there are 9 cities expending more than \$100 per pupil for public education, as compared with the expenditure in Washington of \$77.69 per pupil. If Washington be compared with this group of cities, it will be found that 23 cities are paying more than Washington and 27 cities are paying less.

Total current expenses per pupil.	
Williamson, W. Va.	\$117.60
Globe, Ariz.	111.53
South Amboy, N. J.	109.86
Marshfield, Wis.	109.77
Bozeman, Mont.	109.44
Menrovia, Calif.	109.05
Roselle Park, N. J.	107.39
Pendleton, Oreg.	107.20
Mount Clemens, Mich.	101.43
Sheridan, Wyo.	99.35
Santa Rosa, Calif.	98.06
Manistique, Mich.	94.50
Bennington, Vt.	93.99
Canandaigua, N. Y.	89.42
Oskaloosa, Iowa.	88.89
Stoughton, Wis.	85.39
Montpelier, Vt.	85.27
Lewiston, Idaho.	84.15
Dixon, Ill.	83.21
Sterling, Colo.	83.10
Alma, Mich.	82.91
Mechanicsville, N. Y.	79.58
Latrobe, Pa.	79.29
Washington, D. C.	77.69
Grard, Ohio.	77.57
North Andover, Mass.	77.36
Rockville, Conn.	76.20
Norfolk, Nebr.	71.65
East Conemaugh, Pa.	67.56
Wabash, Ind.	66.64
Marshall, Mo.	66.31
Houlton, Me.	65.66
Shelton, Conn.	64.06
Charleston, Ill.	63.44
Raton, N. Mex.	63.06
St. Charles, Mo.	62.48
Brantford, Conn.	62.08
Vinita, Okla.	61.84
Vineland, N. J.	61.31
Maysville, Ky.	59.16
Chariton, Iowa.	59.11
Logan, Ohio.	56.13
Milton, Pa.	55.40
Presque Isle, Me.	55.24
Suffolk, Va.	44.65
Frankfort, Ky.	43.94
Washington, N. C.	43.46
Ada, Okla.	33.86
Bicknell, Ind.	33.38
Albany, Ala.	31.13
Gainesville, Ga.	24.17

From the above facts it is clear that Congress is now appropriating comparatively less money for public education in Washington than most of the cities of corresponding size are providing, and that many of the smaller cities of the country are likewise paying more for public education than is being paid in Washington. On the basis of these facts, the reasonable increase in appropriations necessitated by this legislation is defensible.

## PER CENT OF MUNICIPAL FUNDS DEVOTED TO SCHOOLS.

In addition to the per pupil cost of public education in Washington the question of increasing the appropriations for public education in the Nation's Capital may be answered by the consideration of another group of facts, namely, the proportion of municipal funds devoted to public education in the several cities.

According to City School Leaflet No. 4, published in December, 1922, by the Bureau of Education of the Department of the Interior, Washington is spending a lesser proportion of her total expenditures for municipal functions than is expended for public education in many other cities. This leaflet shows the per cent of all expenditures for current expenses of all municipal departments in 174 cities in 1920 or in 1921 which was devoted to the current expenses of public education.

## CITIES WITH OVER 100,000 POPULATION.

According to this report, in cities of 100,000 population or more the per cent of total expenditures devoted to the schools ranges from 53.9 in Kansas City, Kans., to 23.8 per cent in Philadelphia. Washington expended in 1920-21, 30.5 per cent of her total appropriations for public education. On the basis of



these figures Washington stands thirty-ninth among 51 cities in the proportion of municipal funds devoted to public education.

The information for the 51 cities is as follows:

*Per cent of municipal funds.*

Kansas City, Kans.	53.9
Des Moines, Iowa	53.5
Oakland, Calif.	51.9
Grand Rapids, Mich.	50.1
Salt Lake City, Utah	47.1
Columbus, Ohio	46.7
Omaha, Nebr.	46.5
Spokane, Wash.	46.0
Reading, Pa.	43.0
Camden, N. J.	42.8
Youngstown, Ohio	41.6
Springfield, Mass.	40.5
Scranton, Pa.	40.4
Los Angeles, Calif.	40.1
Trenton, N. J.	40.0
Yonkers, N. Y.	40.0
Birmingham, Ala.	38.8
Minneapolis, Minn.	38.8
Houston, Tex.	38.6
Rochester, N. Y.	37.7
Dallas, Tex.	37.3
Worcester, Mass.	36.9
Richmond, Va.	35.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	34.5
Fall River, Mass.	34.4
St. Paul, Minn.	33.1
Seattle, Wash.	32.4
Cambridge, Mass.	32.4
Buffalo, N. Y.	32.3
Bridgeport, Conn.	32.2
Denver, Colo.	32.1
Lowell, Mass.	31.8
Indianapolis, Ind.	31.8
New York, N. Y.	31.7
Providence, R. I.	31.4
Atlanta, Ga.	31.1
St. Louis, Mo.	30.8
Syracuse, N. Y.	30.8
Washington, D. C.	30.5
Louisville, Ky.	30.5
Chicago, Ill.	29.8
Pittsburgh, Pa.	29.8
Jersey City, N. J.	29.6
New Bedford, Mass.	29.5
Norfolk, Va.	29.4
Boston, Mass.	28.8
Nashville, Tenn.	27.9
New Orleans, La.	26.8
Memphis, Tenn.	26.4
San Francisco, Calif.	25.8
Philadelphia, Pa.	23.8

*CITIES OF FROM 50,000 TO 100,000 POPULATION (1920-21).*

If Washington be compared with cities of from 50,000 to 100,000 population, that comparison will show that Washington stands fifty-third among 57 cities; that is, 52 of the 57 cities in this group are expending a larger proportion of public funds for their schools than is being expended in the Nation's Capital and only 4 cities are expending comparatively less than Washington:

*Per cent of municipal funds.*

Huntington, W. Va.	62.2
Berkeley, Calif.	60.4
Lincoln, Nebr.	58.3
Sioux City, Iowa	56.7
Springfield, Ill.	54.4
Fresno, Calif.	54.3
Long Beach, Calif.	53.4
South Bend, Ind.	52.0
Allentown, Pa.	51.6
Chester, Pa.	51.6
Lancaster, Pa.	51.5
Rockford, Ill.	51.3
Johnstown, Pa.	50.2
Oklahoma City, Okla.	49.9
Racine, Wis.	48.5
Wichita, Kans.	48.4
Davenport, Iowa	47.6
Gary, Ind.	47.5
Bethlehem, Pa.	47.4
Canton, Ohio	47.2
Highland Park, Mich.	46.9
Eric, Pa.	46.3
Harrisburg, Pa.	46.1
Fort Wayne, Ind.	46.0
East St. Louis, Ill.	45.9
Wheeling, W. Va.	45.6
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	44.8
Passaic, N. J.	44.8
Utica, N. Y.	44.1
Bayonne, N. J.	43.7
East Orange, N. J.	42.0
Springfield, Ohio	41.9
Tacoma, Wash.	41.5
Pawtucket, R. I.	39.7
Somerville, Mass.	39.0
El Paso, Tex.	38.8
Peoria, Ill.	38.8
Binghamton, N. Y.	38.4
San Diego, Calif.	38.2
Hoboken, N. J.	37.9
Knoxville, Tenn.	36.5
Roanoke, Va.	36.1

<sup>1</sup> Data for the school year 1919-20.

Portsmouth, Va.	35.7
Brockton, Mass.	35.4
Elizabeth, N. J.	35.3
Holyoke, Mass.	34.8
Covington, Ky.	34.6
Lawrence, Mass.	34.6
Mobile, Ala.	33.2
Haverhill, Mass.	33.1
Atlantic City, N. J.	31.8
Lynn, Mass.	31.3
Washington, D. C.	30.5
Chattanooga, Tenn.	29.9
Augusta, Ga.	27.0
Macon, Ga.	23.4
Charleston, S. C.	21.8

*CITIES OF 30,000 TO 50,000 POPULATION (1920-21).*

If the percentage of municipal funds devoted to public education in Washington be compared with the proportion of municipal funds expended for public education in cities of from 30,000 to 50,000 population, that comparison will show that Washington stands fifty-ninth among 68 cities; that is, 9 cities are paying a smaller proportion of municipal funds for schools than does Washington and 58 cities are expending a larger proportion of municipal funds for public education.

*Per cent of municipal funds.*

Oak Park, Ill.	62.3
Council Bluffs, Iowa	61.8
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	60.8
Pontiac, Mich.	59.0
Hazleton, Pa.	58.8
San Jose, Calif.	58.0
Waterloo, Iowa	56.8
Anderson, Ind.	56.4
Muncie, Ind.	56.3
Muskogee, Okla.	55.0
Portsmouth, Ohio	54.9
Hammond, Ind.	54.8
Evansville, Ill.	53.6
Pasadena, Calif.	53.4
Charleston, W. Va.	53.2
Kenosha, Wis.	52.0
Springfield, Mo.	51.7
Quincy, Ill.	51.5
Battle Creek, Mich.	50.9
Cicero, Ill.	50.8
Kokomo, Ind.	50.3
Joliet, Ill.	49.1
Lakewood, Ohio	49.1
Ogden, Utah	48.8
New Castle, Pa.	48.4
Bay City, Mich.	47.4
Moline, Ill.	47.1
New Brunswick, N. J.	46.7
Aurora, Ill.	46.1
Colorado Springs, Colo.	45.8
West Hoboken, N. J.	45.4
Oshkosh, Wis.	44.2
East Chicago, Ind.	44.1
Newburgh, N. Y.	43.4
Pueblo, Colo.	42.7
Pittsfield, Mass.	42.6
Everett, Mass.	41.6
Perth Amboy, N. J.	41.4
Dubuque, Iowa	41.2
Phoenix, Ariz.	40.1
Austin, Tex.	39.9
West New York, N. J.	39.0
Charlotte, N. C.	39.0
Chicopee, Mass.	38.8
Auburn, N. Y.	38.3
Beaumont, Tex.	38.0
Medford, Mass.	37.7
Newton, Mass.	37.1
New Rochelle, N. Y.	36.7
Malden, Mass.	35.8
Chelsea, Mass.	34.6
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	34.2
Taunton, Mass.	34.2
Lexington, Ky.	32.9
Waltham, Mass.	32.9
Newport, R. I.	32.0
Winston-Salem, N. C.	31.9
Wilmington, N. C.	31.5
Washington, D. C.	30.5
Newport News, Va.	30.4
Lynchburg, Va.	30.3
Fitchburg, Mass.	30.2
Woonsocket, R. I.	30.1
Montgomery, Ala.	28.0
Galveston, Tex.	26.8
Columbia, S. C.	26.5
Brookline, Mass.	26.2
Columbus, Ga.	24.8

From the above information it is clear that Washington is expending comparatively a smaller proportion of her municipal expenditures for public education than is being expended in a large proportion of the cities of the country.

The conclusion is inevitable, therefore, that both from the standpoint of per capita cost and from the standpoint of proportion of municipal funds expended for public education an increase in expenditure for public education in the Nation's Capital is warranted and indeed must be expected if Congress is to do justice by the schools of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> Data for the school year 1919-20.

## IMMEDIATE COST OF THIS LEGISLATION.

This legislation affects 2,641 employees who were on probationary or permanent tenure on July 1, 1923. The computations of cost are based upon this number of employees and on the assumption that they continue in their present salary classes and advance regularly to the maximum salaries of those classes. These 2,641 employees are distributed as follows:

Title.	Class.	Number.
Teachers of kindergartens and elementary schools.....	1	1,845
Teachers of junior high schools.....	2	62
Teachers in senior high and normal schools.....	3	621
School librarians.....	4	10
Teaching principals with from 4 to 7 rooms, elementary schools.....	5	18
Teaching principals with from 8 to 15 rooms.....	6	59
Administrative principals with 16 rooms or more.....	7	38
Principals of junior high schools.....	8	6
Principals of senior high and normal schools.....	9	9
Directors of special subjects and departments.....	10	17
Heads of departments and assistant principals.....	11	19
Supervising principals.....	12	14
Community center department:		
Director.....	1	2
General secretaries.....	2	1
Community secretaries.....	6	6
Department of school attendance and work permits:		
Director (new position).....	0	0
Chief attendance officers.....	2	2
Attendance officers.....	9	9
Census inspectors (new position).....	0	0
Board of examiners for white schools—chief examiner (new position).....	0	0
Assistant superintendents.....	2	2
First assistant superintendents (new position).....	0	0
Superintendent of schools.....	1	1
<b>Total.....</b>		<b>2,641</b>

The average increase in salary for the 2,641 employees affected by this bill for the first year of its operation is \$153.75. The teaching group, which includes a great majority of the persons affected, will receive average increases in salary during the school year beginning July 1, 1924, over the amount which they will receive under the present schedule during the same year as follows:

## Average increase in salary in Keller bill.

Position:	
Teachers of kindergartens and elementary schools.....	\$132.98
Teachers of junior high schools.....	153.63
Teachers in senior high and normal schools.....	114.28
School librarians.....	124.00
Teaching principals with from 4 to 7 rooms.....	388.36
Teaching principals with from 8 to 15 rooms.....	370.68

The total cost of putting this legislation into operation during the first year beginning July 1, 1924, is estimated to be \$468,745. Under the present fiscal relations between the National Government and the District of Columbia 60 per cent of this cost will be met by taxation in the District, and 40 per cent will be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. The amount which the District of Columbia will pay from taxation is \$281,247, and the amount which will be paid out of the United States Treasury is \$187,498. In comparison with the cost to the Government of increasing the compensation of Federal employees, under the provisions of the reclassification legislation, this increased expenditure for teachers' salaries in the District of Columbia can not be considered exorbitant, but on the contrary must be viewed as moderate and reasonable.

## ULTIMATE COST OF THIS LEGISLATION.

The difference between the minimum salary now paid some groups of teachers and the minimum salary proposed in the Keller bill is not great. This accounts, in part, for the comparatively low cost of putting this schedule into effect during the first year, because the placing of the teacher in the new schedule is based upon the present compensation of those same teachers.

The maximum salaries under the present salary schedule are exceedingly low. The Keller bill establishes maximum salaries considerably higher than the present maximum salaries. The maximum salaries proposed in the Keller bill establish rates of compensation for teachers and officials which are believed to be high enough to be sought by competently trained persons who want to come into the service, and also high enough to retain competent people in the service after appointment. It may be said that this is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the passage of the Keller bill. Naturally, it may be expected that the establishment of these higher rates of maximum compensation will, in the course of a number of years, considerably increase the amount of the appropriations necessary for teachers' salaries in the District of Columbia.

The average ultimate increase in compensation per person for the 2,641 employees is \$830.73. Teachers will reach this

maximum salary only gradually in steps of \$100 per year for several years.

The average per capita increase for teachers in the Keller bill over the present schedule of July 1, 1924, is as follows:

## Average increase in salary in Keller bill.

Position:	
Teachers of kindergartens and elementary schools.....	\$928.32
Teachers of junior high schools.....	834.19
Teachers of senior high and normal schools.....	489.98
School librarians.....	760.00
Teaching principals with from 4 to 7 rooms.....	681.67
Teaching principals with from 8 to 15 rooms.....	670.68

The total increase in appropriations necessitated by the enactment of this legislation was shown in the report of the committee recommending the passage of this bill as follows:

	Cost.	Increase over previous year.
1924.....	\$4,712,055	
1925.....	5,180,800	\$468,745
1926.....	5,445,800	265,000
1927.....	5,710,800	265,000
1928.....	5,974,200	263,400
1929.....	6,218,700	244,500
1930.....	6,462,700	244,000
1931.....	6,710,800	248,100
1932.....	6,968,200	257,400
1933.....	7,075,300	107,100
1934.....	7,211,100	135,800
1935.....	7,280,900	69,800
1936.....	7,295,500	14,600
1937.....	7,304,500	9,000
1938.....	7,310,800	6,300
1939.....	7,317,000	6,200

It should be observed that the increase in cost is gradual and is distributed over a period of 12 or 15 years. This estimate is conservative and is not likely to be exceeded for these 2,641 employees, because the amount of money involved will be reduced whenever one of these persons retires from the school service and is succeeded by a person who is appointed to a salary at the beginning of the salary schedule or, as provided in the bill, to a place in the schedule not more than one-half of the distance up the schedule.

## SUMMARY.

The American people believe in public education. As has been shown, cities of the country are expending from 30 per cent to over 50 per cent of their total revenues for public education. Justice to the school-teachers and officials of Washington requires that Congress increase the salaries for their services. Unless this legislation passes, the comparatively low compensation of teachers in Washington will be actually reduced through the loss of the bonus after June 3, 1924. Congress is not now appropriating as much money per pupil for public education in Washington as are many large and small cities of the country. Moreover, most of the cities of the country are expending a larger proportion of the revenues for municipal government for public education than is being expended for public education in Washington. The Keller bill, which is now before the House, was prepared by the Board of Education after most painstaking attention and extensive consideration. The testimony presented at the hearings on this bill before the Committee of the District of Columbia contains incontestable evidence in support of the salary schedule and legislation contained in the Keller bill. The increased expenditures for teachers' salaries in Washington necessitated by the enactment of this legislation will provide for a corresponding increase in the efficiency and service of the teachers and officers in the schools of the Nation's Capital.

I urge that this bill be passed without amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPERT. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman said that Washington is spending less on its teachers than many cities in this country. What about the cost of living in Washington; is it not true that the cost of living is higher in Washington than most other cities?

Mr. LAMPERT. I find it higher than any place I ever lived in.

Mr. LAZARO. Then it follows that we ought to pay the teachers more.

Mr. LAMPERT. Unquestionably.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I regret exceedingly that I find myself in disagreement with my colleagues on the committee who favorably reported this Keller bill, H. R. 6721. I heartily agree with the raises it provides for the teachers, but I can not accept the enormous raises it gives to the executive officers. Let me give you the history of this proposed legislation.

Under the permission to extend, I insert the following:

On February 2, 1924, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia sent their specially prepared teachers' salary bill, which they said met with the financial program of the President and had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, to the chairman of our committee, requesting that such bill be introduced and passed, and I now quote their letter, as follows:

[Board of Commissioners: Cuno H. Rudolph, president; James F. Oyster; J. Franklin Bell, major, Corps of Engineers, United States Army; Daniel E. Garges, secretary.]

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,

Washington, February 2, 1924.

Hon. STUART F. REED,

Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to transmit herewith a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes, and to request that the bill be introduced by you in the House of Representatives.

It is proposed by this measure to establish a new schedule of salaries for officers, teachers, and other employees of the Board of Education, to be effective on and after July 1, 1924. These several employees are expressly excluded by the terms of the classification act of March 4, 1923, from the benefits thereunder. At the present time teachers and other public-school employees receive the annual bonus of \$240, and unless provision be made for an increase in present basic salaries all these employees would be paid less compensation in the fiscal year beginning July 1 than they now receive.

The commissioners are advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation is not in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Very respectfully,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

By CUNO H. RUDOLPH, President.

CHAIRMAN REED PROMPTLY INTRODUCED COMMISSIONERS' BILL.

Promptly after its receipt Chairman Reed, on the 2d day of February, 1924, introduced the bill sent him by the commissioners, same being H. R. 6576. Just as soon as the subject was taken up for consideration by the committee it was ascertained that this Reed bill, H. R. 6576, which the commissioners said had been agreed upon by the Bureau of the Budget, did not meet with the approval of certain school officials, who had a special bill of their own. The gentleman from Minnesota said immediately that he would introduce the bill these officials wanted, and he did introduce same in the House on February 7, 1924, same being H. R. 6721.

Whereupon the chairman of the committee on February 16, 1924, submitted a copy of this new Keller bill (H. R. 6721) to said commissioners for action by the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16, 1924.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: Inclosed is copy of H. R. 6721 for your consideration and report.

Very truly yours,

STUART F. REED,  
Chairman of Committee.

KELLER BILL IN CONFLICT WITH FINANCIAL POLICY OF THE PRESIDENT.

On February 29, 1924, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia reported adversely on the Keller bill, stating that the Director of the Budget advised that it is in conflict with the financial policy of the President. I quote their letter, as follows:

FEBRUARY 29, 1924.

Hon. STUART F. REED,

Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: With further reference to your letter of February 16, 1924, transmitting therewith for consideration and report a copy of H. R. 6721, entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act

to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to inform you that this bill was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the commissioners are informed by the Director of the Budget, under date of February 28, 1924, that the bill is in conflict with the financial policy of the President.

There is pending before your committee H. R. 6576, of caption identical with that of H. R. 6721, under the provisions of which certain salaries are fixed for teachers, officers, and other employees of the Board of Education, effective on July 1, 1924. The provisions of this bill represented a joint agreement between the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Education, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and was transmitted to you, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, with the statement that its provisions were not in conflict with the financial policy of the President.

Very respectfully,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT  
OF COLUMBIA,

By CUNO H. RUDOLPH, President.

REED BILL, H. R. 6576, JOINT AGREEMENT BETWEEN BUDGET BUREAU, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS.

You will note that in the letter from the commissioners they state that they submitted the Keller bill, H. R. 6721, to the Bureau of the Budget, and that the Director of the Budget advised that the Keller bill is in conflict with the financial policy of the President. You will also note that they further stated that the Reed bill, H. R. 6576, was the joint agreement between the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Education, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

And on March 1, 1924, the chairman of the committee notified Mr. KELLER of such action, sending him a copy of said report from the commissioners, the following being a copy of such notice:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1924.

Hon. OSCAR E. KELLER,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The District Commissioners have submitted a report on H. R. 6721, your bill to fix the salaries of teachers, etc., copy of which is inclosed.

Very truly yours,

STUART F. REED,  
Chairman of the Committee.

REED BILL, H. R. 6576, COMPARED WITH KELLER BILL, H. R. 6721.

For the benefit of my colleagues I will now compare the salary raises in the Reed bill with the salary raises in the Keller bill:

Teachers in kindergartens and elementary schools.

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Group A:			
Reed bill.....	\$1,400	\$100 for 6 years.	\$2,000
Keller bill.....	1,400	\$100 for 8 years.	2,200
Group B:			
Reed bill.....	2,100	\$100 for 2 years.	2,300
Keller bill.....	2,300	\$100 for 3 years.	2,600

UNDER PRESENT LAW.

Under the present law kindergarten teachers are in class 1, and get a basic salary of \$1,200, with an additional \$25 for four years, making the maximum \$1,300, plus the \$240 bonus that is now paid all teachers up to July 1. Elementary school-teachers are in classes 2, 3, 4, and 5. Class 2 receive the same as kindergarten teachers. Class 3 receive a minimum of \$1,200, with a raise each year of \$25 for 10 years, making the maximum \$1,450, with, of course, the \$240 bonus added to all. Class 4 receive a minimum of \$1,200, with a raise each year of \$30 for 10 years, making the maximum \$1,500, with, of course, the \$240 bonus added to all. Class 5 receive a minimum of \$1,200, with a raise each year of \$40 for 10 years, making the maximum \$1,600, with, of course, the \$240 bonus added to all.

Teachers in junior high schools.

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Group A:			
Reed bill.....	\$1,600	\$100 for 5 years.	\$2,100
Keller bill.....	1,600	\$100 for 8 years.	2,400
Group B:			
Reed bill.....	2,200	\$100 for 3 years.	2,500
Keller bill.....	2,500	\$100 for 3 years.	2,800

Both the Reed bill and the Keller bill provide that these junior high school-teachers are to be selected from the elementary teachers having proper qualifications.

Both bills provide that teachers in the junior high school who possess the eligibility requirements of teachers in the senior high school and the normal schools shall be placed in Group C and in Group D, and that Group C shall receive the same salaries as teachers in Group A of the senior high and normal schools, and that Group D shall receive the same salaries as teachers in Group B of the senior high and normal schools.

*Teachers in senior high schools and normal schools.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Group A:			
Reed bill.....	\$1,800	\$100 for 8 years.	\$2,600
Keller bill.....	1,800	\$100 for 10 years.	2,800
Group B:			
Reed bill.....	2,700	\$100 for 3 years.	3,000
Keller bill.....	2,900	\$100 for 3 years.	3,200

*PRESENT LAW.*

Under the present law these teachers in Group A receive a minimum of \$1,440 with an increase of \$100 per year for 8 years, making a maximum of \$2,240, all of them, however, now receiving the \$240 bonus extra until July 1, 1924. Teachers in Group B receive a minimum of \$2,200 with an annual increase of \$100 for 3 years, making a maximum of \$2,500, all of them, of course, receiving the extra bonus of \$240 to July 1.

*School librarians.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Group A:			
Reed bill.....	\$1,400	\$100 for 6 years.	\$2,000
Keller bill.....	1,400	\$100 for 8 years.	2,200
Group B:			
Reed bill.....	2,100	\$100 for 2 years.	2,300
Keller bill.....	2,300	\$100 for 3 years.	2,600

*Salaries now being paid to higher school officials.*

Positions.	Minimum.	Increment.		Maximum.	With \$240 bonus.	
		Number.	Amount.		Minimum.	Maximum.
High-school assistant principals.....	\$2,400	5	\$100	\$2,900		
Principals, senior high and normal.....	2,700	5	100	3,200		
Central High principal.....	3,500	5	100	4,000		
Assistant directors.....	1,800	5	50	2,050	\$2,060	\$2,290
Directors.....	2,000	5	100	2,500	2,240	2,740
Director primary instruction.....	2,400	5	100	2,900		
Supervising principals, director intermediate instruction, supervisor manual training.....	2,400	5	100	2,900		
Assistant superintendents.....	3,750			3,750		
Superintendent.....	6,000			6,000		

While the substantive law permits a salary of only \$5,000 per year to be paid to the superintendent of schools, an extra \$1,000 per year has been paid him through a provision placed in the appropriation bill each year for several years past. So that while under the law he has been authorized to receive only \$5,000, the Congress has nevertheless paid him \$6,000 per year for two or three years past.

*BILL PROPOSES TO PAY SUPERINTENDENT \$10,000.*

The bill proposes to pay Superintendent Ballou \$10,000, which is \$2,500 more than a Congressman receives, and \$2,500 more than a Senator of the United States receives. This should not be allowed. Each year for several years it has been threatened by those who insisted on paying the extra \$1,000 to Mr. Ballou that if we didn't raise his salary we would lose him, but he has continued on for several years, and we haven't lost him yet. Under no circumstances should this salary be fixed at a sum greater than \$7,500. If we should be so unfortunate as to lose Mr. Ballou, there will be plenty of excellent talent and material to select another superintendent within the salary limit. As my colleagues have fixed the salaries of all the administrative officers at much higher figures than they should be, I want to call attention to what our constituents at home think about this question of raising salaries. The people in the States fix the salary of their governor. Let me call your attention to 28 States whose 28 governors do not get more than \$5,000 per year:

*States whose governors receive not over \$5,000.*

State.	Salary of governor.	Name of governor.	Politics.	Expiration of term of office.
New Hampshire.....	\$3,000	Fred H. Brown.....	Democrat.....	January, 1925.
South Dakota.....	3,000	W. H. McMaster.....	Republican.....	Do.
Vermont.....	3,000	Redfield Proctor.....	do.....	Do.
Delaware.....	4,000	Wm. D. Denney.....	do.....	Do.
Tennessee.....	4,000	Austin Peay.....	Democrat.....	Do.
Texas.....	4,000	Pat M. Neff.....	do.....	Do.
Wyoming.....	4,000	Wm. B. Ross.....	do.....	January, 1927.
Maryland.....	4,500	A. C. Ritchie.....	do.....	Do.
Oklahoma.....	4,500	M. E. Trapp.....	do.....	Do.
Alabama.....	5,000	W. W. Brandon.....	do.....	Do.
Arkansas.....	5,000	T. C. McRae.....	do.....	January, 1925.
Colorado.....	5,000	Wm. E. Sweet.....	Progressive Democrat.....	Do.
Connecticut.....	5,000	C. A. Templeton.....	Republican.....	Do.
Georgia.....	5,000	C. Walker.....	Democrat.....	June, 1925.
Idaho.....	5,000	C. C. Moore.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.
Iowa.....	5,000	N. E. Kendall.....	do.....	Do.
Kansas.....	5,000	J. M. Davis.....	Democrat.....	Do.
Maine.....	5,000	P. D. Baxter.....	Republican.....	Do.
Michigan.....	5,000	A. J. Groesbeck.....	do.....	Do.
Mississippi.....	5,000	H. L. Whitfield.....	Democrat.....	January, 1923.
Missouri.....	5,000	A. M. Hyde.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.
New Mexico.....	5,000	Jas. Hinkle.....	Democrat.....	Do.
North Carolina.....	5,000	C. Morrison.....	do.....	Do.
North Dakota.....	5,000	R. A. Nestos.....	Republican.....	Do.
Oregon.....	5,000	W. M. Pierce.....	Democrat.....	January, 1927.
South Carolina.....	5,000	T. G. McLeod.....	do.....	January, 1925.
Virginia.....	5,000	E. L. Trinkle.....	do.....	February, 1926.
Wisconsin.....	5,000	J. J. Blaine.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.

Now, of the remaining 20 States, let me show you the number of governors who do not receive over 7,200 per year:

State.	Salary of governor.	Name of governor.	Politics.	Expiration of term of office.
Florida.....	\$6,000	C. A. Hardee.....	Democrat.....	January, 1925.
Utah.....	6,000	C. A. Mabey.....	Republican.....	Do.
Washington.....	6,000	L. F. Hart.....	do.....	Do.
Arizona.....	6,500	G. W. P. Hunt.....	Democrat.....	Do.
Kentucky.....	6,500	W. J. Fields.....	do.....	December, 1927.
Minnesota.....	7,000	J. A. O. Preus.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.
Nevada.....	7,200	J. J. Scrugham.....	Democrat.....	January, 1927.

Hence you will see that the governors of 35 States of this Union now receive salaries ranging between \$3,000 and \$7,200, and yet my colleagues in this bill are proposing to raise the salary of this school superintendent from \$6,000 to \$10,000. I am against it, because I know that the people back home are against it in at least 35 out of the 48 States.

*First assistant superintendents.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Reed bill.....	\$5,000	\$200 for 5 years.	\$6,000
Keller bill.....	5,000	do.....	6,000
Amount that should be allowed.....	3,500	\$100 for 10 years.	4,500

Under no circumstances should the salary provided for in the committee bill be granted to assistant superintendents. It is out of all proportion to salaries paid to other important public officials. Circuit trial judges in most of the States do not receive over \$4,000, and they try men for their lives, and try civil cases involving millions of dollars in property rights.

*Assistant superintendents.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Reed bill.....	\$4,300	\$100 for 4 years.	\$4,700
Keller bill.....	4,200	\$100 for 5 years.	4,700
Amount that should be allowed.....	3,200	\$100 for 8 years.	4,000

*Chief, board of examiners.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Reed and Keller bills.....	\$4,000	\$100 for 5 years.	\$4,500

Thus under the Keller bill there will be paid to colored examiners \$4,500 per year, or \$500 per year more than the governors of seven States receive, and that much more than the circuit trial judges of most of the States now receive.



## SUPERVISING PRINCIPALS.

Both the Reed and Keller bills pay the supervising principals a minimum basic salary of \$4,000 with an annual raise of \$100 for five years, or a maximum salary of \$4,500.

They now receive \$2,400 with an annual increase of \$100 for five years, or a maximum of \$2,900. Their salary should be fixed at not more than \$2,700, with an annual raise of \$100 for eight years, which gives them a maximum of \$3,500.

It will be remembered that most of these officers have already served the required number of years to start them in with the maximum at once, immediately following the passage of this law, to take effect July 1, 1924.

*Heads of departments and assistant principals.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Reed bill.....	\$3,200	\$100 for 3 years.	\$3,500
Keller bill.....	3,200	\$100 for 5 years.	3,700
Amount that should be allowed.....	2,700	\$100 for 5 years.	3,200

Under the present law they now receive \$2,400 with an annual increase of \$100 for five years, or a maximum of \$2,900. And those receiving less than \$2,500 also receive the bonus of \$240.

## DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL SUBJECTS AND DEPARTMENTS.

Under both the Reed bill and the Keller bill it is proposed to pay the above a minimum of \$3,200 with an annual increase of \$100 for three years, making a maximum of \$3,500. This is entirely too much and should be cut down considerably.

## PRINCIPALS OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND NORMAL SCHOOLS.

Under both the Reed bill and the Keller bill it is proposed to pay the above \$4,000 basic salary, with an annual increase of \$190 per year for five years, making a maximum of \$4,500. They now receive a minimum of \$2,700, with increase of \$100 for five years, making a maximum of \$3,260, and it is proposed to give them a \$1,300 raise. It is entirely too much by at least \$500 to \$750, and should be cut down.

## PRINCIPALS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.

Both the Reed bill and the Keller bill propose to pay the above a minimum basic salary of \$3,500, with an annual increase of \$100 for five years, making a maximum of \$4,000. It is entirely too much, and should be cut down.

*Administrative principals with 16 rooms or more and principals of vocational and Americanization schools.*

	Basic salary per year.	Annual increase.	Maximum salary.
Reed bill.....	\$2,700	\$100 for 3 years.	\$3,000
Keller bill.....	2,900	.....do.....	3,200

The above is entirely too much and should be cut down. And I shall offer amendments from the floor to reduce these unwarranted raises, and hope that my colleagues in the House will support same, and thus uphold the Bureau of the Budget.

## FAVOR THE RAISES TO THE ACTUAL TEACHERS.

I am in favor of granting the raises to all the actual teachers who really perform the hard work in the schoolrooms, and the never-ending home work that all good teachers must do, if they are conscientious in performing their duties.

## THE OLD 50-50 BASIS OF FISCAL RELATION.

Let me again ask why is it that the Government of the United States should be called upon to build and maintain the Washington schools? There are 70,000 school children in attendance. Many of them belong to families who have no connection whatever with the business affairs of this Government. There are about 2,500 children living in Virginia and Maryland who attend the Washington schools. Why should the Government be called upon to build the buildings, buy the playgrounds, furnish the free schoolbooks, and pay the salaries of the twenty-five hundred and odd teachers to teach them? Until 1921 the whole people of the United States paid 50 per cent of all this expense. And since 1921 the whole people of the United States have paid 40 per cent of such expense. Why should they pay any part of it? Why shouldn't Washington people pay the expense of sending Washington children to Washington schools?

## PRESENT 60-40 FISCAL RELATION.

Under the present system now in force the people of Washington pay a total tax of only \$1.20 on the \$100, on both real and personal property, with a personal property exemption of \$1,000 free of all taxation, and with their property assessed at about half valuation, and the whole people of the United States then pay all the balance

of their expenses under this ridiculous 60-40 fiscal system, under which the Government makes numerous appropriations for the District of Columbia local civic matters, in numerous supply bills, where the appropriation is taken out of the United States Treasury 100 per cent.

## AFFECTS ENTIRE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

This is not a bill that affects merely the people living in the District of Columbia. It affects all of the people in the whole United States, for the whole people of the Nation pay 40 per cent of all the salaries of the officers and employees of this school department and of all of the other expenses of the District of Columbia. And the people of Washington pay a total tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, assessed at about half valuation, while, counting the State, county, school, and other civic taxes, all of the other cities of the United States, both small and large, pay taxes running from \$2.75 to \$6 and \$7 per \$100.

## THE OLD SLOGAN HAS WORN THREADBARE.

Whenever a Member of Congress seeks to change the unjust system of allowing the people of Washington to pay the ridiculous tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, the newspapers and citizens' associations immediately resort to their old battle cry—

"That Washington is the Nation's Capital and must be made the most beautiful city in the world; that the Government should pay a big part of the local city expenses because it owns so much property here."

Washington is the Nation's Capital and should be made the most beautiful city in the world, and I will go just as far as any other man through all legitimate and proper means to make it the most beautiful city in the world. Before the Government built all of its fine institutions here Washington was a mere village. Property here was of little value. It is because of the fact that the United States has spent its millions here that has caused some lots to jump in value from \$100 to \$100,000. Every piece of property owned by the Government in Washington is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington.

The local pay roll of the Government is a bonanza to the merchants and business enterprises of Washington. The Government pays its nearly 100,000 employees in Washington their wages promptly every two weeks in new money that has never been spent before. Chicago, or any other big city in the United States, would gladly exempt the Government from paying all taxes on its property to get it to move its capital to such city.

Because we want to make it the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for building million-dollar school buildings and employing 2,500 teachers and buying the schoolbooks for the 70,000 school children of the thousands of families living in Washington who have no connection whatever with the Government except to bleed it on all occasions and to grow rich on the Government pay rolls expended here.

Because we want to make Washington the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for the army of garbage gatherers, the army of ash gatherers, the army of trash gatherers, the army of street cleaners and sprinklers, the army of tree pruners and sprayers, and the street-lighting system for the several hundred miles of private residences owned by rich tax dodgers who have no connection whatever with the Government; nor is it any reason why the Government should pay for their water system, their sewer system, their police protection, their fire protection, for playgrounds for their children, for parks for their enjoyment, for their municipal golf grounds, for their numerous public tennis courts, for their bathing beaches, for their skating ponds, for their cricket grounds, for their baseball and football grounds, for their horseback riding paths, for paving the streets in front of their residences and maintaining and keeping them in repair, for building their million-dollar bridges, furnishing million-and-a-half-dollar market houses, their municipal trial and appellate courts, their jails and houses of correction, their municipal hospitals, asylums for their insane, special asylum schools for their deaf and dumb, asylums for their orphans, a university for their 110,000 colored people, their municipal libraries, their municipal community-center facilities, salaries of all their municipal officers, employees, buildings, furnishings, equipments, sanitary and health departments, and the hundreds of other things that all other cities of the United States must furnish and pay for themselves, but a very substantial part of which the people of Washington have been getting out of the Federal Treasury for years.

The magnificent Capitol and its beautiful grounds are daily enjoyed by Washington people. The Congressional Library, which cost \$6,032,124, in addition to the sum of \$585,000 paid for its grounds, and for the upkeep of which Congress annually spends a large sum of money, is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington. The Government furnished and maintains the magnificent Botanic Garden here for the pleasure and enjoyment of Washington people. The Government furnished and maintains the wonderful Zoo Park, with all of its interesting animals, for the instruction and amusement of Washington children. The Government furnished and maintains the extensive and most beautiful Rock Creek Park, with its picturesque

picnic grounds, its miles of wonderful boulevards, its incomparable scenery, all for the pleasure of Washington people. Congress has spent millions of dollars reclaiming and purchasing the lands now embraced in the Potomac Parks and Speedway, daily used and enjoyed by Washington people. The Government has spent several million dollars building the various bridges spanning the Potomac River, and huge sums for the bridge spanning the Anacostia River, and spent \$1,000,000 building the beautiful "Million-Dollar Bridge" on Connecticut Avenue. The Government has spent millions of dollars on the Lincoln Memorial, grounds, and reflecting pools, the Washington Monument grounds, Lincoln Park, on East Capitol Street, and the numerous beautiful little parks scattered all over the city, all for the pleasure and benefit of Washington people.

During the recess of Congress I wrote to the mayor of every city of any size in the United States and asked them to advise us of their local tax rate, of the charges for water, sewer, paving, etc., and what rate, in their judgment, they thought Washington people should pay as a minimum. I want to insert just a few in this report. The consensus of opinion was that the rate here should be at least \$2.50 per \$100, and there was a large per cent who were in favor of it being much higher, and the rates for taxation ranged from \$2.75 to over \$6.50, and in all these cities the people were charged more for water, sewer, and paving.

Let me again quote a few excerpts from the letter sent me by the mayor of the city of Peoria, Ill.:

[City of Peoria, Ill. Mayor's office. Edward N. Woodruff, mayor.]

NOVEMBER 1, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering your questionnaire of October 15, concerning relative tax rates of the cities of Washington and Peoria:

The tax rates on each \$100 taxable valuation levied against the real and personal property of the citizens of Peoria for the year 1922 is itemized as follows:

City corporate tax, including library, tuberculosis, garbage, and police and fire pension fund.....	\$1.94
Street and bridge.....	.24
School district.....	2.70
Park district.....	.41
	\$5.29
State.....	0.45
County.....	.59
County highway.....	.25
	1.29
Total, all purposes.....	6.58

Unless there is a tremendous revenue derived from sources other than from taxes the rate of \$1.20 for Washington is ridiculous. While I have never had my attention called to this disparity, I am amazed that the light has not been let into financial affairs of the Capital City long before this time.

You should be supported by every colleague in your effort to compel the citizens of Washington to do theirs, even as every citizen outside the District is doing his.

Wishing you success, I am,

Very truly yours,

E. N. WOODRUFF, Mayor.

The foregoing statement from the mayor of Peoria, Ill., fairly indicates the sentiment of the people over the United States. It might be enlightening to quote from a few of the letters received the tax rates of some of the cities over the United States as certified to me by the mayors of such cities.

When I speak of the tax rate of these cities I, of course, mean their total tax—State, county, school, and municipal—which is the total tax citizens of those respective cities have to pay on their property, as compared with the \$1.20 on the \$100 rate Washington people have to pay in the District of Columbia.

The Tax rate paid by the people in Baltimore, Md., \$3.27 on the \$100; in New Orleans, La., \$3.16½ on the \$100; in Portland, Oreg., \$4.52 on the \$100; in my birthplace, Houston, Tex., \$4.29½ on the \$100; in Ogden, Utah, \$3.33 on the \$100; in Cheyenne, Wyo., \$3.75 on the \$100; in Fort Smith, Ark., \$3.32 on the \$100; in New Bedford, Mass., \$3.13; in Burlington, Vt., \$3.10 on the \$100; in Pittsburgh, Pa., \$3.22 on the \$100; in St. Louis, Mo., which is a distinct political subdivision of the State, the city tax is \$2.43 on the \$100; in Boston, Mass., \$2.47 on the \$100; in Rochester, N. Y., \$3.36 on the \$100; in Portland, Me., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Boise City, Idaho, \$4.29 on the \$100; in Mobile, Ala., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$2.75 per \$100; in Duluth, Minn., \$5.79 on the \$100; in Atlanta, Ga., \$3.15 on the \$100; in Kansas City, Mo., \$2.93 on the \$100; in Minneapolis, Minn., \$6.52 on the \$100; in Salt Lake City, Utah, \$3.18 on the \$100; in Oakland, Calif., \$4.02 on the \$100; in Austin, the capital of Texas, \$3.54 on the \$100; in Denver, Colo., \$2.78 on the \$100; in Trenton, N. J., \$3.22 on the \$100; in Racine, Wis., \$2.87 on the \$100; in Nashville, Tenn., \$2.80 on the \$100; in Charlottesville, Va., \$2.85. And let me illustrate as the tax rate runs generally over Texas: In Paris, Tex., \$4.10 on the \$100; in Port

Arthur, Tex., \$3.54 on the \$100; in Tyler, Tex., \$4.61 on the \$100; in Denison, Tex., \$3.32 on the \$100; in Waco, Tex., \$3.63 on the \$100; in Amarillo, Tex., \$3.55 on the \$100; in Temple, Tex., \$3.15; in Wichita Falls, Tex., \$5.05 on the \$100; in Beaumont, Tex., \$4.04.

Mr. Edward F. Bryant, tax collector for San Francisco, Calif., has sent me a statement certifying that the following is the tax rate paid by the citizens in the following cities: In Seattle, Wash., \$8.80 on the \$100; Chicago, Ill., \$8 on the \$100; in Reno, Nev., \$7.38 on the \$100; in New York, N. Y., \$5.48 on the \$100; in Philadelphia, Pa., \$6 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$4.48 on the \$100; in San Francisco, Calif., \$3.47 on the \$100; in Los Angeles, Calif., \$3.89 on the \$100.

What excuse have we to offer to our constituents back at home who are paying the above tax rates for permitting by our votes here the 437,000 people in Washington, D. C., to continue paying the measly little pittance of only \$1.20 on the \$100, based on a half to two-thirds valuation, when our constituents have to pay all the balance of the expenses of this great city?

#### THIS VERY UNFAIR, RIDICULOUS FISCAL SYSTEM MUST CEASE.

No Congressman or Senator here can give any good reason why our people at home should continue to pay 40 per cent of all the expenses of running the schools of Washington; of paying the salaries of 2,500 teachers; of furnishing free schoolbooks to 70,000 Washington children; of building million dollar school buildings; of buying numerous playgrounds. If our people at home all knew about it, and knew that they were paying 40 per cent of all of the other expenses of this great city, they would not keep any of us here much longer, if we voted to continue it.

I gave notice some time ago that I have drawn my sword against this pernicious system, and shall keep it unsheathed, and continue this fight until it is changed and until the people of Washington pay a fair rate of taxation, just the same as the people of every other city, large and small, in the United States have to pay; and I am going to raise this question in every bill that comes up which seeks to make the whole people pay the civic expenses of Washington people.

I realize that in this bill it will be impossible to change this pernicious tax system, as any amendment that I might offer for such purpose, would be out of order under the rules of the House, and the chairman in charge of the bill would make a point of order against such amendments, were I to offer them. Such a change will have to come in a separate measure, and I shall not rest until I get such a bill favorably reported to the House for passage.

But let me get back to a discussion of some of the high salaries of executive officers in this bill, which should be reduced. When the initial measure was first prepared for submission to the Board of Education, commissioners, and the Budget Bureau, the high executive officers from the superintendent of schools down, saw to it that their salaries were taken care of and raised to the highest notch possible. Hence these high raises were in the bill the commissioners sent to Chairman REED, which he introduced, and which is known as the Reed bill (H. R. 6576).

When our friend from Minnesota [Mr. KELLER] introduced his bill in lieu of the Reed bill and sought to raise the salaries of the teachers over and above those which had been granted by the commissioners bill, Mr. KELLER's bill was submitted to the Budget Bureau for consideration, and I have called your attention to the fact that the Budget Bureau has disapproved of the Keller bill. It says that it is not in accord with the financial policy of the President of the United States, and they disapprove of it. But I am going to show you how you can bring the Keller bill within the limit of the Budget Bureau and not hurt a single teaching teacher. I propose to leave the teachers' salaries just as Mr. KELLER has fixed them in his bill and chop off at the top enough of the big raises allowed executive officers to bring that bill within the Budget estimate.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. The Reed bill, preferred by the Bureau of the Budget, fixes the salary of the superintendent at \$8,000.

Mr. BLANTON. No; at \$10,000.

Mr. KELLER. No, sir; \$8,000.

Mr. BLANTON. That is quibbling between tweedledum and tweedledee. I will show that it is \$10,000, and the gentleman should be fair with our colleagues. Whenever you fix a basic salary of the superintendent at \$8,000 and then grant him \$1,000 a year for two years' services, when he has already served the two years, you make it a \$10,000 salary, and my friend knows it as well as I do. That is what was done. The superintendent has already served the two years, and the very minute you pass this bill, instead of it being a basic salary of \$8,000, it becomes a salary of \$10,000, for he will draw \$10,000.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not a fact that he started in at \$8,000?



Mr. BLANTON. No. The bill does specify that the basic salary shall be \$8,000, with an annual increase of \$1,000 for each year for two years' service; but as he has already served his two years he will get the maximum of \$10,000 to start with.

Mr. SNELL. I am told that the previous service does not apply to the superintendent.

Mr. BLANTON. Practically all of the salaries will start in not at the basic salary on July 1 but at the maximum salary, because most of these officers and teachers already have served the number of years provided for in the bill.

Mr. KELLER. That is not the fact.

Mr. BLANTON. I will show that that is the fact.

Mr. SNELL. I am definitely told that the superintendent does not start in at \$10,000; that his previous service does not apply in this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Show me the provision in the bill where it specifies that it does not apply. I have studied the bill as carefully as any man on the committee.

Mr. SNELL. I am told that it does not apply to the present director.

Mr. BLANTON. It does apply, and the gentleman from New York will find it out.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman's interpretation of the bill is correct, it can easily be changed by an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. SNELL. I am willing to have an amendment adopted to that effect.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not in favor of paying him \$10,000.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman may make that statement, but he should not put it on something else.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the bill as it is now written. If the gentleman can find a provision in it that shows that the years already served, constituting longevity allowance does not apply to the superintendent, let him show it to me. There are provisions in the bill which specifically provide that the years already served either in the Washington schools or in any other accredited schools shall be allowed to the teachers in computing their longevity placement. And there is not one word in the bill that prevents the executive officers and superintendent from enjoying the same privileges.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman is referring to the superintendent?

Mr. BLANTON. I am referring to the teachers, officers, and the superintendent.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does not the gentleman think that \$8,000 is a pretty fair salary, counting capacity and experience of the present superintendent, without any provision for an additional salary? That is \$500 more than the average Congressman is receiving. Is not that a sufficient salary?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; more than sufficient. Seven thousand five hundred dollars is enough. I am willing to admit that the present superintendent is just as efficient as any other we could probably find. I have no attack whatever to make on him as an individual or as a superintendent. I think he is probably as good as we can get. I am willing to accept that assumption anyway. I have no fight to make against him. I am fighting the \$10,000 salary that he has arranged for himself to draw.

Mr. SHERWOOD. But I asked the gentleman a question. Does he not think that \$8,000 a year is sufficient salary?

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is more than sufficient. Seven thousand five hundred dollars is as large as we should make it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A sharp controversy has arisen between the gentleman who is now speaking and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KELLER] as to the proper interpretation of this matter of the basic salary. Was that question discussed in the committee?

Mr. BLANTON. Why, it has been so well understood all of the time that there was no room for discussion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I presume, then, that the gentleman will have no objection if there is a question about it incorporating an amendment making it absolutely clear that the law shall not have retroactive effect.

Mr. BLANTON. If you even start to put such an amendment into this bill that prior service shall not count you will have all the teachers and officers in the gallery turning somersaults. Leave it to the occupants of the gallery, and they will tell you that it is their prior service that they want to count.

And they understand that it does count in this bill. And, as a matter of fact, it does count.

If we are going to hire a superintendent at \$10,000 a year, I am as willing to hire Mr. Ballou as anybody else, and if anybody is going to lobby, I am willing to have him lobby. He has lobbied as little as any man I ever saw connected with the schools. I have seen lobbyists who would not let you walk down the corridor without meeting them in the House Office Building, and he has not done that. I do not think I ever saw him more than three or four times in the House Office Building since I have been on the committee, but he has no business drawing this big salary out of the Treasury, and I will tell you why.

Let me again remind you of what your constituents think about big salaries. What do your constituents at home think about your governor's salary? They fix the governor's salary. Remember that down in Georgia, where the genial gentleman, Mr. UPSHAW, lives—and he now wants to raise the salary as high as the top-notchers—the people there fix the governor's salary at \$5,000 per year in Georgia, as shown by this latest Congressional Directory. The people of the States have had the question submitted to them time and time again to raise the salaries of the governors, but they refuse to do it. Let me show you what the people say about it. In New Hampshire they pay Gov. Fred. H. Brown a salary of \$3,000 a year.

Mr. UPSHAW. That is not enough.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes it is, in New Hampshire. At least, the good people of New Hampshire say it is.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I do not think Mr. Ballou is worth \$7,000 a year more than the Governor of New Hampshire. In South Dakota those good Republicans out there pay Gov. W. H. McMaster \$3,000 a year.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am going to get to New Jersey in a minute. In Vermont, up in the good old maple-sugar section, the Republicans there pay Gov. Redfield Proctor a salary of \$3,000 a year.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. I must remind my colleagues of what the people at home think about salary raising.

Mr. SNELL. Why not talk about school-teachers instead of governors?

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about salaries and salary raising. The people fix the salaries drawn by our governors.

Mr. SNELL. Why not talk about the salaries of superintendents of schools?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to show the difference between what you pay a governor at home and what you expect to pay a superintendent of schools in Washington.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. And is it not a fact that the State superintendents of schools in these various States receive less money than the governors?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no doubt about that. Up in Delaware the good people pay Gov. William D. Denney a salary of \$4,000 a year. In Tennessee the people pay Gov. Austin Peay a salary of \$4,000 a year as governor. Down in my own State, we Texas people pay our governor, Hon. Pat M. Neff, a salary of \$4,000 a year. Out in Wyoming the people pay their governor, William B. Ross, the salary of \$4,000 a year.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am now coming over into Maryland, the home of our friend Mr. ZIHLMAN, and I want to show what his constituents and those of our distinguished rider of the great white charger from Baltimore pay their governor. In the State of Maryland they pay Gov. A. C. Ritchie a salary of \$4,500 a year, and do you know what you are undertaking to do in this Keller bill? You are undertaking to pay the members of the board of examiners here in the District of Columbia \$4,500 a year—as much as the Governor of Maryland receives.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield to me now for some information?

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a minute. Down in Oklahoma the good people of that State pay Gov. M. E. Trapp a salary of \$4,500 a year and in Alabama the people pay Gov. W. W. Brandon a salary of \$5,000 a year.

In Arkansas they pay their governor, Hon. T. C. McRae, \$5,000 a year. In Colorado they pay their governor, Hon. William E. Sweet, \$5,000 a year.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In Connecticut they pay their governor, Hon. C. A. Templeton, \$5,000 a year. In Georgia they pay \$5,000 a year to Governor Walker, and I will say to my friend, who says it is not enough, that he ought to go home and convert his constituents first, and he ought to convert those good people of Atlanta first and get them to pay their governor more money before he comes here and wants to pay the superintendent of schools \$10,000 a year, doubling what many governors get.

Mr. STEPHENS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I prefer the gentleman use the time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLMAN].

Mr. STEPHENS. Does the gentleman know how much they spend maintaining those governors?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. For the present I refuse to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This message on salary raising comes from the people at home. It will bear repeating. In Idaho they pay Governor Moore \$5,000 a year. In Iowa, in that old rock-ribbed Republican State where the tall corn grows, they pay Governor Kendall \$5,000 a year.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. And in Kansas they pay Gov. J. M. Davis, \$5,000 a year. Up in the rock-ribbed Republican State of Maine they pay Governor Baxter \$5,000 a year. In Michigan they pay Governor Groesbeck \$5,000 a year. In Mississippi they pay Governor Whitfield \$5,000 a year—

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In Missouri they pay Governor Hyde, \$5,000 a year. In New Mexico they pay Governor Hinkle \$5,000 a year. In North Carolina they pay Governor Morrison \$5,000 a year, and in North Dakota they pay Governor Nestos, \$5,000. In Oregon they pay Governor Pierce \$5,000 a year. In South Carolina they pay Governor McLeod \$5,000 a year—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They pay him \$7,500 now.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a late raise, for I am reading from the latest Congressional Directory. And over in the big State of Virginia, just across the Potomac River, they are paying Governor Trinkle \$5,000 a year at this time. And you are seeking on this side of the river to raise the salary for the school superintendent up to \$10,000 a year.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. CONNERY. As the gentleman has been speaking about the governors of the various States, I will say for the information of the gentleman from Texas that in my home city of Lynn, Mass., with a population of 100,000, we pay the superintendent of schools \$9,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not surprised a bit.

Mr. WOLFF. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LAMPERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I simply was going to ask the gentleman if he was not aware there is some difference between the governorship and the position of superintendent of schools, and if the gentleman does not take into consideration the trimmings which sometimes go with the governor's job?

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman referring to the State of Indiana—

Mr. WOLFF. I am referring to Indiana, Missouri, and various States.

Mr. BLANTON. Trimmings! I never did like that word at all; it got the Governor of Indiana into trouble.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Does not section 4 of the act provide:

That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, they shall receive the salary provided in the foregoing schedule—

And so forth. And does not section D, which includes the superintendent's salary, provide that they shall receive the salaries provided in the foregoing schedule for their respective salary classes or positions, which are next above their present compensation, and manifestly the superintendent will start in at \$8,000 by the language of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not the understanding of the school board.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That is the language of this.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not the understanding of the committee, that is not the understanding of the commissioners, for the later provisions in the bill provide otherwise.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. JONES. I would like to suggest in that connection there is a proviso about the middle of page 10, which is—

*Provided, That under the provisions of this section the present compensation of any teacher, school officer, or other employee shall be construed to include basic salaries, longevity allowance—*

And so forth.

Mr. LEHLBACH. But he does not draw any longevity allowance at the present time. It says the present salary and then goes to the salary next above that.

Mr. JONES. And the next proviso says that teachers and other employees shall be entitled to longevity placement. What does that mean?

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I have been contending all the time.

Mr. SNELL. Is the gentleman sure about this beginning at \$8,000—

Mr. BLANTON. We will fix that—

Mr. SNELL. Then what is the use of talking about that?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say this to you: The present salary is \$6,000 a year through the favor of our Committee on Appropriations, but the law grants only \$5,000 a year at present to the superintendent of schools. We are now paying him \$6,000, which is \$1,000 more than the law allows. This bill giving him \$10,000 will double his present legal salary.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman if he denies that.

Mr. LAMPERT. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the salary paid in the city of Dallas, Tex., for the superintendent of schools. It is \$7,200.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I am asking that the salary to be paid the superintendent here be cut down to \$7,500, which is \$300 more than they pay at Dallas.

Mr. LAMPERT. And the salary of the superintendent in Houston is \$6,000, and in San Antonio it is \$6,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin can use those figures in his own time.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

The law at present grants to Mr. Ballou \$5,000 a year. Under the law he is allowed only \$5,000 a year now; that is all the substantive law allows him. But there has been a provision put in the appropriation bill for the last few years granting him an extra gratuity of \$1,000. That makes it \$6,000. But if my proposition is correct as to this bill relative to the basic salary operating on past service, he would start in immediately on July 1 on a \$10,000 salary. That would be \$5,000 more than the present law authorizes and \$4,000 more than he is receiving now, even under the gratuity given by the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, if it were a matter that concerned the District of Columbia alone, I would not have a word to say; not a word. But it does not concern only the District of Columbia. It concerns also every taxpayer under the United States Government, as I have already pointed out, because they are paying 40 per cent of all the expenses of the schools in the District of Columbia.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I want to know what the duties of the chief examiner and the other examiners are, and what the duties of the attendants are. That is very important, because we fix the salaries here.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows what a school examiner is without my taking the time to explain to him. This fiscal relation is something that you and I permit by our votes to exist here year after year, and I want to bring it to your attention and to the attention of the people of the country. Every school building in Washington, except the last two and one-half million dollar Eastern High School, was built on the plan of 50-50, which means that the Government paid half.

Fifty per cent of it was money that came out of the pockets of the whole people of the United States, and the whole people of the country are now paying 40 per cent of all new buildings and playgrounds, and schoolbooks for 70,000 children, and all the salaries of these 2,500 teachers and employees of the Washington schools, and of the entire expenses of the city.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I can understand why the Federal Government ought to pay a certain per cent on the dollar for the maintenance of this city, but is there any reason in the world



why our taxpayers and yours should pay 40 per cent on the education of the children here?

Mr. BLANTON. Not any reason whatever. I will get down to that in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. The people in Washington here pay a \$1.20 tax rate on \$100 with the assessment at from one-half to two-thirds of the valuation, while in your homes and mine we pay all the way from \$2.75 up to about \$6 or \$7 or \$8 on the hundred. Until the people of Washington pay a fair rate of taxation this Government ought not to pay a cent. It has expended millions of dollars in this city and has made little \$100 lots go up in value until they are now worth \$100,000. I am in favor of making this city the finest city in the world, but that is no reason why we should vote to allow these millionaire tax dodgers to pay only \$1.20 on the hundred, based on an assessment of from one-half to two-thirds of the valuation, while you and I in our homes pay \$3, \$6, or \$7, or \$8 on the hundred.

Why, a prominent Senator told me not long ago that at home, where he has a residence that he has been trying to sell for \$7,000, on that residence he pays more taxes in his home State than he pays here for his \$25,000 residence in Washington. Suppose you own a 20-foot front that you want to build a residence on—and this will illustrate how the millionaire contractors in Washington are able to dodge their fair share of the taxes. Suppose you have a 20-foot front, the average front, and you propose to put in a sewer connection. They have to dig out as far, sometimes, as from here to that door. You pay \$1.50 a front foot, which is only \$30. The property owner pays that, and the city and Government pay the balance of all that excavating, and the people of the United States pay 40 per cent of that. The owner pays only \$30, and he gets his sewer connection, thereafter paying a dollar. If you want water you pay \$2 a foot for the excavation, while all the rest of that excavation is paid for by the Government and the people of the District at the rate of 60-40, and then the owner gets his water from that time on at about one-fourth of what your people down home pay, because the Government owns the main water conduit.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. When a sewer is put down across a piece of vacant property, the property owner does not pay anything if it runs over 10 or 15 years before that open plat is finally utilized?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I understand that is true.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLeod].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

[Mr. McLeod was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, one of the most distinguished privileges which Providence has conferred upon mankind is learning. Upon the education of a nation rests the hope of all classes. Accordingly, the kind attention bestowed upon the education of the young determines chiefly the kind of nation that is to be perpetuated. In fact, the whole worth of a nation lies in its schools. Remove the schools and there will follow as a natural consequence a rough, rude, ignorant, and anarchical populace. Education, however manifold in its relations, takes account of all forms of progress and produces a sturdy, cultured, peace-abiding, and patriotic citizenry. The primary importance, then, of education lies in its ability to cultivate the faculties of impressionable youth, thus rescuing such powers from possible blight or decay.

In the body politic of a nation there are three indispensable classes: The laborers, who minister to the wants and comforts of all the citizens; the guardians of the peace, who protect with zealous devotion the honor of their flag; and the philosophers, who enunciate the principles and disperse the thoughts of the nation. Only when these three classes work in harmony can there be perfect concord. The unifying agency to bring them into a common relation with one another is education, maintained under the best influences. Thus the importance of education is revealed in its power to inspire all classes of a nation to expend every particle of strength in doing the work for which they are best fitted, to stand right up to their tasks, and to do their best.

Undoubtedly the supreme importance of education lies in its recognition of the fact that the soul, as well as the mind, is

endowed with faculties susceptible of cultivation and growth. Thus heart culture is one of the modern aims of education. There is widespread recognition of the aphorism that a man is what his heart is. Education, therefore, seeks to cultivate the heart. It realizes that in every man there is a native spiritual power which is subject to the general law of human development. By proper stimulation and exercise such power lives and grows strong. By neglect and disuse it becomes dwarfed and enfeebled until there is no consciousness of the possession of such power. Education, then, stimulates this spiritual power, thus making possible the highest culture, which embraces both the intellectual and the spiritual power.

Such is the importance of education. Happily, in this country, the true idea of education, of its real nature, and of its unquestionable importance is silently working and gaining ground. Overcrowded schoolhouses throughout the land are the unmistakable indications of a sagacious and industrious nation. There can be no retracing of steps. The command is, "Forward march!"

#### THE TEACHER AS A PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEE.

The chief factor in education is the teacher. As the old adage goes, "Like teacher, like school." Under almost any circumstances good teachers make good schools and poor teachers make poor schools. Education, consequently, becomes a sham unless carried on by able and accomplished teachers. Expensive apparatus without an intellectual, gifted teacher becomes a questionable expenditure of funds, whereas such a teacher, without apparatus, may accomplish the happiest results. The greatness of any school lies not in its buildings, furnishings, or apparatus, but primarily in its faculty. It follows, then, that the most direct and effective way to improve public education is to secure the highest order of teaching talent.

Unfortunately, teaching has been regarded too long as merely a stepping-stone to some remunerative profession like law or medicine. The careers of some of the most serviceable men of the Nation date their beginning from the teacher's desk. The classroom has been losing steadily its grip upon the best talent of the Nation. At last, however, the dignity of the teaching profession is beginning to be understood. The idea is dawning that few callings are comparable in solemnity and importance to the training of the child—that skill in guiding the young into energy, truth, and virtue. The Nation is beginning to require the instructors of youth to take their place among other professional employees and receive a compensation commensurate with their talent. Pecuniary compensation, of course, does not necessarily create good teachers. These must be formed by individual impulse and a genuine interest in their calling, but good impulse must be accompanied by outward circumstances. The respect in which the profession of teaching is held in any community is reflected partly in the pecuniary rewards of the profession.

Like the lawyer and the doctor, the teacher is a professional employee. He must, therefore, have an extensive training in the arts and sciences of a liberal education and an intensive training in his profession. Such a training is continuous and expensive. No teacher, regardless of his enthusiasm, can long maintain the standards of his profession if he has to give much of his time to the thought of economic pressure. As a professional employee, a teacher must be sufficiently free of economic worries to give attention to his own professional growth. Moreover, he must be able to maintain a standard of living that will be inspiring to the young.

The one outstanding need, therefore, in the system of public education is that of better-paid teachers in order that they may become in reality professional employees rather than veritable mendicants begging for bread and receiving a stone. Only when the teacher is appreciated and rewarded as a professional employee will teaching take its place alongside of the other professions and compete with them for the most talented products of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. McLEOD. I rise in support of this bill for the reason that I consider education the basis of good citizenship, and, while many of us consider that education comes as a matter of course, yet we must see to it that no serious trouble arises for lack of the proper facilities.

To-day the schools have taken over the burden of the training of the child. In this time, when both parents very often go out to work, not only the formal education of the child—reading, writing, and arithmetic—is turned over to the school

but the modeling of his manners and morals and the care of his physical being.

Deplorable as it may seem the burden of the home and home training of children is to-day in the hands of the school and the school-teacher. If we are to intrust the real modeling of the character of our children, the future citizens of this Republic, to the schools we certainly must be willing to provide for adequate facilities, including a just and equitable scale of salaries to be paid these teachers, and salaries that will attract men and women fit to carry on these tremendous tasks.

Washington has been rather slow in providing the proper facilities, both as to teachers' salaries and material equipment. Since no legislation has been passed since 1906, except in the yearly—temporary—legislation carried in the District appropriation bill, it is quite necessary that some remedial measures be taken to conform with the changing conditions and to stabilize a permanent wage scale. I venture to say that there is not one of the membership of this Congress who would knowingly retard education in the District of Columbia or any other place in the United States. As a member of the subcommittee considering this bill, I feel justified in saying that every perceivable angle has been thoroughly gone into, and if you will examine the hearings I believe you will agree that this is sound legislation.

The requirements for entrance and promotion in the teaching profession are as high in the District of Columbia as elsewhere, yet there is a lack of applicants because the salaries are not commensurate with duties and qualifications required. The salary increase for the teachers of the District which is provided for by the bill now before the House is not a large increase; it merely places them more nearly on a par with other cities of its size. The present salary given to a grade teacher is \$1,440—\$1,200 basic salary and \$240 bonus. The bill asks that they be given an entrance salary of \$1,400 and progress through eight years of service to \$2,200. The present salary given to a high-school teacher is \$1,680—\$1,440 basic salary and \$240 bonus. The bill asks for high-school teachers that they be given an entrance salary of \$1,800 and progress through 10 years of service to \$2,800. This you will note is not an exorbitant increase.

If we are attempting to make Washington—our Capitol City—a model, why then should not education be promoted to its fullest degree in order that it may rank among the first as an educational center.

Therefore, the passage of this bill is the first step toward bringing this about. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDELOM). The time of the gentleman has again expired.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LEHLBACH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 and 44 to the bill H. R. 6349, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 624. An act to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

#### SALARIES OF TEACHERS, SCHOOL OFFICERS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], comparing the work of the teacher or school superintendent and other men and women connected with the schools to the work of politicians, men who run for public office and who serve their people in a different capacity. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. BLANTON and I have learned to love him to a great extent, but I have to differ with him sometimes when I see he is wrong.

It seems to me that the people throughout these United States, not only in the District of Columbia but in this body which we compose, have always overlooked the importance of the profession of teaching. The greatest asset of any nation is its chil-

dren. The wealth and prosperity of this Nation are dependent upon the way its children are trained and are taught to live in the future. We are dependent upon citizenship—the right kind of citizenship—on what is done in the schoolhouses of this Nation.

Our people have never until recently commenced to realize that this was an important profession, but I am glad to say that from one end of the Nation to the other the people are now beginning to realize that we need in the schoolroom the very best men and the very best women we have in this country.

It takes more than an ordinary man and an ordinary woman to teach school. Almost anybody who can go out and make a good speech, shake hands, and get into the good graces of the people can be elected to a political office, but in order to be a successful school man or school woman it takes different characteristics. We first, must have a man who is a moral man; we must have a man who is tactful; we must have one who is educated, and we must have, furthermore, a man who is more interested in the welfare of his country, its people, and its future, than he is in anything else. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman feel that a man can not be a politician and at the same time be a moral and honest man?

Mr. GASQUE. He can be, but he is not always that, or, at least, some politicians are not always that.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. GASQUE. I will, sir; but I can not yield very much, because I have not much time.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman understand that the gentleman from Texas is in favor of a reduction in the teachers' salaries?

Mr. GASQUE. No; only in the superintendent's salary, but he is in favor of a reduction in the teachers' salaries, and I commend him for that.

I want to come now to the point regarding the superintendent's salary and I just want to make a few general remarks as to the laxity of thoughtfulness on the part of our people regarding this work. My friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and others would probably not say anything if they were voting for the salary of a member of the Shipping Board. The gentleman from Texas speaks about a Congressman's salary being \$7,500. Well, I want to say about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], as I have been in pretty close touch with him and observed him pretty closely, that he ought to get \$100,000 a year for the work he does, because I believe he is one of the hardest-working men I know of. But it is not a question of what these men get, it is a question as to whether you and I are going to let the conditions continue which now exist as to the salaries of teachers.

We must all realize that we have men and women in this country who are teaching school because they love the work, and that they are not in that work because of the salaries they get. That being so, should we sit down and see these men and women give the best part of their lives to this work and say that just because they are school-teachers they are not worth more money? I do not believe any of us is willing to take that position.

Now, I want to call your attention to the salaries of public officials, to which Mr. BLANTON referred a while ago. I want to say that we have five Members of the Federal Trade Commission, for whom I presume the gentleman from Texas voted. They get \$10,000.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I voted against that.

Mr. GASQUE. Well, this House did it anyway, if my friend from Texas did not. The Comptroller of the General Accounting Office is paid a salary of \$10,000 a year, and that being so why should we pay them any more than Congressmen? Members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, 11 of them, get \$12,000 a year, voted by this House. The nine members who compose the Railroad Labor Board get a salary of \$10,000 each, and seven members of the Shipping Board get a salary of \$12,000 each. Now, those are the salaries of some of the Government officials, and I do not think they are worth any more than some Members of this body, as far as that is concerned, if we are going to use that as an argument. Furthermore, if we go into private business we find men drawing salaries of from \$25,000 to \$150,000 a year. And I want to say right here that the biggest business in this Nation is the training of the youth of this land. [Applause.] If our people would realize that fact there would be no objection to voting increased salaries for those engaged in training our youth.



We come to Congress and ask for appropriations which are intended to increase the wealth of the country and to develop certain sections through irrigation, through agriculture, through banking, and through many other means, and we do not hesitate to vote millions of dollars for such purposes. And when we stop to think that the greatest wealth-producing factor or agency we have in this country are the children of this country we should not hesitate to pay proper salaries to those who are training the future citizens of the country, and we must realize that it is necessary to offer proper salaries to the men who have charge of our schools and the women and men who are doing the work in those schools and who are giving our children that proper training.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman and I agree very fully on this question of salaries for teachers, but would the gentleman be interested in comparisons between what Congressmen receive and what other officials receive?

Mr. GASQUE. I do not think that has anything to do with this question.

Mr. SNYDER. I wanted to see if the gentleman was willing to say he was not satisfied with the congressional salary and would like to see it raised.

Mr. GASQUE. I did not run for this office for the salary paid. If I had had that in mind, I would not have run for it.

Mr. SNYDER. And would the gentleman want these salaries fixed on the same basis?

Mr. GASQUE. I came here for a different purpose. In answer to your question about salaries, if you want to decide what the salary of a superintendent of schools in a city of this size should be, let us see what the other cities of the United States are doing, and I want to call your attention to this fact before I forget it. If you will go through all the statistics you want to wade through and study them until you are an old man, you will find this fact, which can not be contradicted.

The per capita wealth of the States of this Union is in direct proportion to the amount of money the State expends for schools and for the education of its children. We have in the United States 38 cities of 100,000 or more, as has already been called to your attention, that pay more salary to their superintendents than the city of Washington pays, 9 cities that pay the same, and 10 cities only that pay less. I just want to call your attention to a few of them, because I have not time to mention them all. Of course, New York and Chicago are much larger cities, but then we come to Cleveland, Ohio, which pays \$12,000; Detroit, Mich., \$12,000; Oakland, Calif., \$11,000; Jersey City, \$10,500; Boston, Mass., \$10,000; Buffalo, N. Y., \$10,000; Newark, N. J., \$10,000; Cincinnati, \$10,000; Youngstown, Ohio, \$10,000; St. Louis, Mo., \$10,000; Denver, Colo., \$10,000; Toledo, Ohio, \$9,750.

Gentlemen, I feel that the school system of the city of Washington should be the very best in the United States, and we should offer salaries here, both for a superintendent and for teachers, that will attract the very best men and women available in the profession, because here everybody comes. This is your city and my city. I agreed with my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], very largely in the latter part of his speech as to the pro rata portion that the Nation pays to the support of this city, but I am surprised that he should stand up here and say that if the District of Columbia paid it all he would have no objection. Gentlemen, that is not the question before you and me. We are here, and under the Constitution this matter of legislation is left in our hands, and the citizens of this city can not get anything you and I do not give them. If that arrangement is wrong, then it is up to this Congress to change it and make the appropriations like they should be [applause], and if we do not want to pay any of it do not pay it, but do not let us use that as an argument against a teachers' pay bill. [Applause.]

But let us realize that these men and women who are engaged in the work of making citizens, making men and women of the youth of our country, are paid a fair salary, at least a salary partially commensurate with that paid men and women in other professions. Also, let us do our duty by this city and District, the Capital of the Nation, the Capital of the greatest Nation in the whole world. The people of this city are dependent on this body for its progress along all lines, educational as well as along all other lines, and the argument that the rest of the Nation pays too much toward the support of the District should not be taken into consideration in this matter. This body fixed that ratio and is the only agency that has the authority to change it if it feels that it is paying too much.

In my opinion the chiefest duty we of this generation, or any other generation, has to perform is to see that our children,

the future citizens of this great country, are properly trained, morally, physically, intellectually, and in the principles our forefathers had in mind when they wrote the Constitution of this great Republic. In so far as we as a people succeed in this, either as individuals or as a Nation, our lives have been a success, and in so far as we have failed in this our lives have been a failure. The citizens to whom you and I must turn over in a short while the management of this great country are dependent on you and me. This body of men, Congress, should show to the rest of the country the importance of this great work. We can not do it by paying niggardly salaries to the men and women engaged in this great work. This is our opportunity; let us not lose it.

[Mr. GASQUE was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some question about the position taken by the gentleman from Texas in regard to the basic salary at which the superintendent would start. On the first page of the bill the language is, "that on and after July 1, 1924, the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, shall be as follows." Now if you will turn to page 7 of the bill you will find the definite application to the superintendent of schools, with a basic salary of \$8,000 per year and an annual increase of \$1,000 for two years or until a maximum of \$10,000 per year is reached. To me this is definite, plain, absolute language and there can be no misunderstanding whatever, and he will start at \$8,000 per year.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] consumed most of his time in talking about something else besides the superintendent of schools. We are not electing a governor or hiring one. I am working here for \$7,500 a year too, and I do not know whether I earn it or not, but I am paying men twice that salary to work for me at home, and there are a lot of other people doing exactly the same thing. The only question before us here is whether we are paying or proposing to pay the superintendent of schools too much or whether we are paying more than the average city of this size and character is paying. It seems to me that is the only question before us.

We want the best schools in Washington—better than they have in any city in the country—and the only way you can decide this question of salary is by comparing the price paid here in Washington with other cities of similar character and size. In the list of similar cities Washington is the thirty-ninth city on the list. There are 38 cities that pay more than Washington, 9 that pay the same, and only 10 cities that pay less.

The gentleman from Texas said we must consult the taxpayers. I suppose the taxpayers in the State of Texas elect their superintendents and decide the salary to be paid. San Antonio, Tex., with 161,000 inhabitants, about one-third that of the city of Washington, pays the same for a superintendent of schools that the city of Washington pays. Houston, Tex., with 138,000, or less than one-third, pays the same as the city of Washington, and Dallas, Tex., with 158,000, about one-third, pays \$1,200 more than the city of Washington, and there the taxpayers pay it all and fix the salaries themselves. So the taxpayers of your own cities are not averse to paying a reasonable salary to superintendents of schools.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman said there were only nine or ten cities that paid less than Washington—

Mr. SNELL. I meant cities of similar size and character.

The only question before us is whether we are paying a reasonable salary and the salary that could be expected for the services performed. I know and the people here know and the gentleman from Texas knows that we have a good man—a man who is capable of filling the position. If he is, let us pay him a reasonable wage and a proper wage in comparison with other men who are doing the same work in every part of the country.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SNELL. I will yield; gladly.

Mr. RAKER. It is not a question of the special individual who occupies the position now.

Mr. SNELL. That has nothing whatever to do with it, really.

Mr. RAKER. It is a question whether the position justifies the amount of salary proposed.

Mr. SNELL. That is the real, basic question before us—whether the position, in comparison with similar positions in other cities of the same size throughout the country, should carry the same amount of salary.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman tell us what is the largest salary paid a superintendent of schools?

Mr. SNELL. At the present time, according to this list, \$12,000 a year. I understand, however, they are going to pay in New York City \$20,000 after this year.

Mr. RAKER. And the gentleman is thoroughly convinced that with this amount of work and responsibility any superintendent who is capable and competent to handle the work would earn, and justly earn, this amount of salary?

Mr. SNELL. I honestly think so, because I think it is one of the hardest school systems to handle in the country, and such a man has more to contend with here than in any other city of its size in the country, and any man who can do it successfully is entitled to this amount of salary, and no one should oppose giving it to him.

Mr. RAKER. Is not there a further condition involved that this city ought to be a model of schools in Washington, and we ought to stand No. 1 in the United States?

Mr. SNELL. I have already made that statement. I feel that this should be an ideal system and that we should have the best teachers we can find to fill the positions.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I will use all the 10 minutes which has been yielded me by my colleague [Mr. BLANTON] in the discussion of this bill, but I do want to make a few brief comments on the proposed legislation. Of course, we all know that legislation is so continually pressing upon the House for consideration that Members do not have an opportunity to study all the bills as much in detail as we would like, and it is that way with me on this particular bill. I have not had the opportunity to read and study the bill as I would like to have had, and I do not profess to be as well acquainted with its provisions as the members of the committee who reported it to the House. But I have studied it enough to convince me that it is my duty to vote against the bill unless it is amended in some substantial respects.

When I came back to attend this session of Congress I told the people of my district that I was going to stand for economy in public expenditure. I told those people whom I consider it an honor to represent that in my judgment the most important duty of this session of Congress did not lie in the realm of new legislation, but that the most important problem confronting the American Congress was to bring about a reduction in public expenditures so as to bring about a real, substantial reduction in taxation.

I have been trying to make that promise good on every bill that we have had before the House. Last Saturday I sought to recommit the Army bill with an amendment to reduce the standing Army from 125,000 men to 100,000 men. If that amendment had been adopted, it would have saved this Government during the next fiscal year \$25,000,000. And yet it was defeated by gentlemen who will go back to their districts and say that they are earnestly and sincerely in favor of Government economy. It is very clear to me that this Government has no need for a standing Army of more than 100,000 men.

This number of men, together with a well-maintained National Guard and a proper reserve force, will make ample provisions for the national security and defense.

On this pending bill I entertain no delusion as to what is going to be done. I never do entertain any delusions as to what is going to be done when a salary increase bill is before the House of Representatives. It is going to be passed by gentlemen who will go back home and say to their people, "I am earnestly and sincerely in favor of Government economy." My experience since I have been a Member of the House has been that our old acquaintance "economy" has more friends in general debate and less on roll call than any gentleman whose acquaintance I ever made.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the gentleman think that paying the teachers an adequate salary and thus getting good teachers is bringing about economy?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. There is no dispute between the gentleman and myself on that proposition. Some of the salaries for the lower-paid teachers provided for in this bill are all right, but others are entirely too high. Also there is no justification for the proposal to increase the salary of the superintendent of schools in the city of Washington from \$6,000, as under present law, to \$10,000, as would be the case if this bill passes. I clipped, to-day, from the Dallas Morning News, that has just come to the reading room, an article giving some information about salaries of our teachers in Texas. I will ask the indulgence of the House while I read this clipping:

#### TEACHERS' PAY REPORTED HIGHEST IN THE STATE.

Dallas high-school teachers receive from \$1,400 to \$2,400 a year, with an automatic increase of \$75 a year until the maximum is reached, which is the highest rate of pay paid by any city in Texas, according to the publicity committee of the Dallas Council of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, which is supporting the present board of education for reelection April 1.

Now, what does that say—best-paid teachers in Texas in the city of Dallas. High-school teachers receive from \$1,800 to \$2,400 a year.

Let us compare this Dallas schedule of salaries with those provided in the bill now before us. We have in this bill pay of teachers of the junior high school as follows:

Group A, a basic salary of \$1,600 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,400 per year is reached.

Group B, a basic salary of \$2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group C, a basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group D, a basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

Those are for the junior high school. Now, let us see about the teachers in the senior high school and normal school. They get—

Group A, a basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group B, a basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I want to finish the reading of this clipping which I took from the Dallas News with reference to Texas teachers' salaries:

The scale of pay in Fort Worth ranges from \$1,100 to \$1,800, and in San Antonio from \$1,300 to \$1,900.

The faith of the Dallas teachers in the present board of education, the committee pointed out, was shown the first part of the school year when they accepted the condition of possible salary reductions of 5 per cent for the current year in their contracts. The board has decided that through the practice of careful economy school funds will be adequate and no reduction of salary for the year will be necessary.

The present salary rate for teachers was adopted by the board of education four years ago and is being maintained for the avowed purpose of enabling Dallas schools to have the pick of teachers from the entire State.

Principals' salaries range from \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year. Grade teachers receive from \$1,200 to \$1,700 a year, with an automatic increase of \$70 a year until the maximum is reached.

The salary scales in Dallas are considerably lower than the salary scales provided in this bill. The difficulty that the city of Dallas is having, as evidenced by the clipping which I have just read, is to preserve the salary scale that it now has. The problem which the school board of that city has is to find out how it can maintain what they now have, which the article says is the best in the State of Texas. Why should I, as a representative in this body who professes to my people that I try to stand for reasonable economy in Government expenditures, vote for the teachers in the city of Washington a very much higher scale than prevails in the best-paid city in the State of Texas? I am perfectly willing that Washington teachers be well paid, but this bill goes too far in the matter of increasing salaries, especially those of supervisory officials.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman wants to be fair. What about the cost of living in Dallas and in the city of Washington?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The cost of living in the city of Dallas, I dare say, is about as much as it is in the city of Washington, and the gentleman will be convinced of that if he will examine the figures from the Bureau of Labor statistics. He will find that it costs just as much to live in the



city of Dallas as in the city of Washington. Rents are of course higher here in Washington, but other items which enter into the budget which make up the cost of living are about the same.

Mr. LAZARO. I have looked up the statistics, and I say that the cost of living is higher in the city of Washington than in any other city of the country.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, the gentleman is entirely in error. There are other cities in the United States which have a higher cost of living than Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not only in favor of economy but I try to practice it. A statement about economy is one thing and its application is another. It is a question of whether or not you are going to get service, whether or not a dollar expended gets a dollar of service in return. That is what is to be applied here. There is no occupation in which the people are more interested than they are in the occupation of those who instruct the youth of our land. They want to get those who are competent, those with knowledge and experience, and in order to do so you must pay a salary commensurate to the job. There is no doubt in the world that it costs more to live in the city of Washington by from 5 to 15 per cent than it does in any other city in the country.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield. There is no need of trying to deny that or of caviling about statistics. You are here and your money is taken from you, whether you want to have it taken from you or not. We ought to pay these who do the work fair salaries.

I have not had the opportunity to visit the schools here as I would like. While we are spending our money lavishly upon every other enterprise that brings in the dollar, we are too negligent and thoughtless in regard to spending our money to build up and make citizens, not only those in our own country but those who come here from other countries. I concede from what I have observed that a teacher in the District of Columbia has more difficulty in impressing the right ideas upon the American youth, boy and girl, than in practically any other city in the United States. What I say I do not mean as a censure to the teachers, but I am wondering whether or not these boys and girls who are leaving the high school do so with a sense of responsibility and are able to do anything to earn a living for themselves, or is the only thought in their minds to make a living by an easy method, without having to do any work or assuming any responsibility. Irrespective of the amount, if the teachers are really giving their time and attention to imparting not alone book learning but inculcating in these boys and girls the principle of Americanism, and are teaching them to earn their livings when they leave school, the salaries proposed are not too high. It is economy in the highest degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending bill reclassifying the salaries of the teachers in the city of Washington. To-day these teachers are receiving the bonus of \$240, but this will not be paid after July 1, and unless Congress before that date provides for a reclassification of these salaries the compensation of the teachers will be greatly reduced.

Washington is the capital of the Nation. Its educational system should be a model for the municipalities of the Nation. It should set the standard in efficiency. It can not do this unless the teachers are paid salaries that will induce competent men and women to serve. The hearings disclose that the salaries now paid, including the bonus, are less than the salaries paid in other municipalities having a population of 100,000 or more. Washington's population is approximately 450,000. I shall vote to make the salary of the superintendent of schools \$7,500, with the increase provided in the bill for service, and I shall vote for the salaries of teachers as provided in the bill. In order to secure an appointment as teacher in the high schools of Washington it is necessary that a teacher shall be a college graduate. Under this bill the teacher in the elementary grades now receiving a basic salary of \$1,440 would receive \$1,800. Of course the salary of the high-school teacher is greater. Of the 2,640 employees of the educational department of the District, the average salary at pres-

ent is \$1,804, and under this bill the average salary will be \$1,957, an increase of \$153.

A few years ago the salaries of teachers were so absurdly inadequate that competent men and women deserted the profession and entered other fields of endeavor. They could not be blamed for their desertion. The missionary spirit is apt to desert one under such circumstances. The plasterer in the city of Washington was and is now being paid \$12 a day. Only a short time ago I was told by a contractor in this city that he had to pay good carpenters \$1 per hour and time and a half for overtime. Compare this compensation with the salary of the teacher who, in order to secure a position as teacher in a high school, must produce evidence of a college education.

And compare the work in which they are engaged. Into the hands of the teachers the people commit the dearest that they possess, and as they make them, so shall future years see them. Some persons complain of the growing cost of education. The National Educational Association is responsible for the statement that last year the total cost in the country was approximately \$1,000,000,000. A great sum of money, but small when compared with the amount spent last year for tobacco, which was slightly over \$2,000,000,000.

With the increasing number of women in industry the responsibility of training children devolves to a greater extent upon the teachers. We used to say, "Poor pay, poor preacher." It is equally true, "Poor pay, poor teacher." If men and women engaged in teaching are to regard it as their life's work instead of a mere stepping stone to some other work in life they must be paid such salaries as will cause them to put their hearts in their work. The teachers must work not only during the school sessions but during the vacation period; must travel and study in order to equip themselves to render efficient service. This costs money.

In the State of South Carolina great progress has been made in our educational system. But I know of young women, graduates of a splendid college, who desired to teach and preferred to remain in South Carolina, but have gone into other States because of the increased compensation to be secured. They can not be criticized for seeking the field of endeavor offering the greatest reward. And that is true of Washington. The hearings show the difficulty now experienced in securing competent teachers. This bill offers an opportunity to remedy conditions. We have had much eloquence as to the nobility of the profession of the teacher. Let us now give them a little less eloquence and a little more compensation.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the figures in this bill do not frighten me at all because I have lived through a teachers' salary increase. While a member of the city government of the city of New York, as president of the board of aldermen, we increased the teachers' salaries. The increase that we put through in 1920, which took effect in 1921, added over \$20,000,000 to the city budget. Personally, I believe that under our form of government a public-school teacher is worth more to the community than three generals or two preachers. The least we can do is to pay them accordingly. I want to give you some figures in respect to the city from which I come, where we have a real department of education, the greatest in the world. Our budget for the year 1924 for that purpose was \$75,805,000, and that does not include \$15,000,000 which is spent for new buildings. In addition to that we have a retirement system which costs \$3,500,000 a year, and then we have for the College of the City of New York a budget item of \$1,190,000, and for Hunter College, our normal school and college for girls, a budget item of \$856,391. None of the city's money is better spent.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the tax rate there?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. About 3 per cent; that I would say is about the average for the five boroughs.

Mr. BLANTON. That is exclusive of the State tax?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; that is the city tax on real property. In addition to this I would say that about \$10,000,000 comes back to us, which is our share of the State school fund. Our tax average is about 3 per cent on real estate in the five counties. We pay our superintendent in New York City \$12,000 a year, and it is a \$20,000 a year job. A comparison was made here between the salaries of governors and the salary proposed to be paid to the superintendent of schools. The case of a governor is not analogous. It is not a fair comparison. If a man has been a good governor of his State and he has been honored by the people of his State in that way, there are all sorts of chances for him when he leaves the job, if he has performed a good job. A superintendent of schools gives his whole life to the work and there is not the

music and the glamour and the glory about it that goes with the position of governor.

For instance we pay in New York City the superintendent of school supplies \$9,000, our superintendent of school buildings, the architect, \$25,000 a year, and his deputy \$6,500 a year. We have clerks, chief clerks, at \$6,500.

Why, gentlemen, the greatest American institution, the greatest monument to American progress, is our public school system, and the place to economize is not in the salary of the splendid teachers of the kindergarten, the grammar schools, or the high schools. [Applause.] I am proud of my city's schools and our department of education.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is it not a fact that nearly 32 per cent of your total expenditures of New York go to educational purposes and that a less percentage is devoted to educational purposes in the District of Columbia—that it exceeds the percentage in the District of Columbia?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Our biggest item in the New York budget is the schools, then is followed by the police, fire, and health departments. We ought to have the model educational system of the whole world right here in the Nation's Capital. We ought to give adequate compensation to teachers—

Mr. HUDSPETH. Can the gentleman give the average pay for primary teachers—give us the average in New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not itemized by the budget which I have before me—I have it in the office—but it is about 15 or 20 per cent larger than we propose to give right here. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, may I have the privilege of extending my remarks a little on this subject?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks I insert the following:

*To the Senators and Representatives in Congress:*

The Anti-Saloon League broadcasts from coast to coast that it controls Congress and practically all State legislatures.

If that is true this important question arises:

Who controls the Anti-Saloon League, and why—and how?

If the Anti-Saloon League controls Congress and the State legislatures, as it asserts, then the power that controls the Anti-Saloon League is the power that controls the lawmaking bodies of the United States.

What is that power?

Wayne B. Wheeler, general counsel for the Anti-Saloon League and chairman of its political campaign committee, tells the American people in public addresses that \$35,000,000 was spent to put the eighteenth amendment into the Constitution.

The Christian Science Monitor, a champion of the Anti-Saloon League, asserts that the league is spending \$2,500,000 a year. The New York and Illinois State branches of the Anti-Saloon League spend approximately \$600,000 a year.

Where does the Anti-Saloon League get its money?

The power behind the Anti-Saloon League is money. The big contributors of the money constitute the real power behind the Anti-Saloon League.

**SPENDS FOUR TIMES AS MUCH AS DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS.**

Four years after prohibition the Anti-Saloon League is spending every year a sum equivalent to the combined sums spent in four years by the Democratic and Republican National Committees to maintain their organizations and conduct presidential campaigns.

To maintain an invisible government, which the Anti-Saloon League asserts controls the visible government chosen by the people, this league is spending four times as much money as the Democratic and Republican national organizations combined.

For what purpose or purposes are such vast sums of money contributed to an organization which renders no public financial accounting, and which has been able to defeat every legislative effort to investigate the source and disbursement of its revenues?

If representative government is to be maintained in the United States, these questions must be answered.

Congress can answer by investigating the Anti-Saloon League to determine the source and distribution of its revenues and its boasted control of the lawmaking branches of government. Reasons will appear herein why Congress especially should investigate the power exercised over the prohibition enforcement unit.

#### PROHIBITION AS A "GOOD BUSINESS INVESTMENT."

The purpose of this message is to give Congress a starting point for an investigation of the Anti-Saloon League revenues, and to show the necessity of a complete and thorough investigation of the prohibition enforcement department under Anti-Saloon League domination.

Read the facsimile letter from S. S. Kresge, chairman of the manufacture and business committee of the Anti-Saloon League.

Observe that he states that this committee is comprised of 55 persons whose identity is not disclosed.

Observe that Mr. Kresge, who, according to financial reports, has an annual income of approximately \$10,000,000, solicits contributions to the Anti-Saloon League solely as a "good business investment."

He states that the 55 men on this committee are interested in prohibition as a "good business investment."

He has solicited money from manufacturers and business men all over the United States, to be used by the Anti-Saloon League, solely as a "good business investment."

#### MASQUERADING UNDER FALSE COLORS.

This letter reveals as clearly as language can reveal it that the Anti-Saloon League is masquerading before the country under false colors.

It pretends to be a political machine representing the Christian churches of America.

Kresge's letter shows it to be a political machine representing the big business interests in the United States.

It pretends to represent the churches to promote temperance and morality.

Kresge's letter reveals that it represents big business interests for selfish purposes only—to help them to make more money, as Kresge phrases it, "by keeping the liquor bloodsucker off decent trade."

It uses the church as a shield and the pulpit as the forum to promote the selfish interests of the men who are putting up the money to support it.

It boasts that it controls Congress and State legislatures, and whatever power of control it exercises is the power that it derives from the great sums of money contributed to it, primarily by selfish interests, as a "good business investment."

#### OIL LEASES "GOOD BUSINESS" UNTIL EXPOSED.

It was "good business" for oil corporations to stuff the pockets of a Cabinet official with money and walk away with leases of public domain—until the Senate investigated.

Then it was bad business. So bad the Nation was shocked. Official corruption, the purchase of official influence, and the silencing of newspapers that shared in the spoils, aroused country-wide indignation.

It may be "good business" for great interests to use the Anti-Saloon League to cloak their selfish schemes, but it will be bad business when the American people know all the facts—particularly those facts dealing with official corruption resulting from the adoption of a prohibition law to enrich the interests that financed it.

The amount of graft involved in the oil scandals is infinitesimal as compared with what would be exposed by a thorough investigation of prohibition enforcement. Where a few are involved in oil scandals, thousands would be involved in prohibition scandals.

#### CORRUPTION FUND OF \$4,000,000 IN 60 DAYS.

Here is a statement, for example, appearing in the September issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, by Hon. T. Henry Walnut, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States at Philadelphia:

"\* \* \* It is undoubted that enormous quantities of liquor were withdrawn from the distilleries upon fraudulent permits and that enormous sums of money were paid for them. The permits so issued by the Pennsylvania office (of the Federal prohibition commissioner) in a period of 60 days called for 700,000 gallons of whisky and alcohol. The corruption fund arising from these papers must have run close to \$4,000,000."

When such things as this are going on—and this is but one of thousands of scandals in the history of prohibition—is it any wonder that Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, a sincere prohibitionist, in speaking before the Anti-Saloon League convention in Washington, said:

"Take it by and large, I know of no scandal in our national history to compare with it. A scandal of half the proportions in any other branch of the Government's work would lead at once to a congressional investigation. In the name of the citizens of the country who believe in its Constitution and law, and who propose to support and enforce them, I voice the general demand for such an investigation."

#### LEAGUE OPPOSES EXPOSURE OF CORRUPTION.

But the Anti-Saloon League, invisibly financed and pursuing invisible political methods, while publicly posing as the champion of all that is moral and virtuous in life and government, steadfastly opposes every suggestion of an investigation of prohibition scandals and even goes to the extent of blocking officials of the Government in their effort to expose them.



Listen to this from Collier's Weekly of January 26, 1924:

"When Haynes [the Federal Prohibition Commissioner] sat down to write his book, *Prohibition Inside Out*, he was bound and gagged, politically speaking. Had he been free of political impediments, he could have written a book the sensational disclosures of which would have staggered the Nation—a book which would have shamed men in high places, knocked halos from the heads of others, and gone down in history as one of the most astounding documents in the history of this Republic. \* \* \* Haynes was tempted. While he wavered between duty to the American people, especially the prohibitionists, and loyalty to his political party, the master politician of them all—Wayne B. Wheeler—stepped in. Wheeler advised caution, Haynes listened, and the result was just a book.

"Haynes couldn't and didn't write the inside story of prohibition, because the story would have bared the corrupting influences of politics in prohibition enforcement and explained why the Federal Government has fallen down in the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment."

What are the sensational facts that would have staggered the Nation? Who are the men in high places who would have been shamed? Who are the men who would have had halos knocked from their heads?

#### IF LEAGUE SPEAKS FOR CHURCHES, WHY DOES IT STAND FOR THIS?

If Mr. Wheeler, in his official capacity as counsel for the Anti-Saloon League, is representing the Christian churches of America, why is he trying to protect the men in high places who would have been involved in prohibition scandals, and why is he stopping the baring of the corrupting influences that have resulted in the Government's failure to enforce the eighteenth amendment?

Publicly he proclaims that the Anti-Saloon League stands for honest enforcement. All the facts indicate that neither the Anti-Saloon League nor Mr. Wheeler have ever taken any step to purge the Government of the corrupting influences that are having such direful effect upon the country, and have prevented the enforcement of the prohibition law.

If Mr. Wheeler and the Anti-Saloon League are in fact representing the Christian churches of America, what do the Christian churches think about it when Mr. Wheeler and the Anti-Saloon League use their power to block every movement to expose the corrupting influences in prohibition enforcement?

The very next day after Governor Pinchot demanded a congressional investigation of the prohibition scandal, Mr. Wheeler rushed into the newspapers with an interview opposing it.

We are informed that the *Ladies Home Journal*, at great expenditure of money and effort, gathered facts revealing scandalous practices in the prohibition enforcement department, and that Mr. Wheeler advised the suppression of this article, and that it was suppressed.

For what reasons? Let Congress call the editors and Mr. Wheeler and find out.

#### PRICE THE COUNTRY PAYS TO MAINTAIN "GOOD BUSINESS."

What further price are the American people paying to maintain prohibition as a "good business investment" for the "John T. Kings" who are financing the Anti-Saloon League?

According to the late President Harding "a nation-wide scandal that is the most demoralizing factor in our national life."

According to Governor Pinchot, "no scandal in our national history to compare with it."

According to the Attorney General of the United States, "a sordid story of assassination, bribery, and corruption that found its way into the very sanctums where the inviolability of the law was presumed to be sacred."

According to thousands of thinkers and writers, an institution that has broken down respect for all law, spread crimes of violence from coast to coast, corrupted governmental functions as nothing else in our national life ever has done, and has proven an utter failure as a temperance measure.

In addition to all this, the money cost has been monumental—in losses of revenue and actual outlay for Federal, State, and local enforcement.

#### INVESTIGATE FINANCES OF ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE.

We respectfully submit that the time has arrived when Congress should investigate the Anti-Saloon League to disclose the source not only of the \$35,000,000 fund which Mr. Wheeler says was used to influence the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, but also the source of the \$2,500,000 a year contributed, in part at least, as a "good business investment," and which is now used to maintain a standing organization of approximately a thousand members.

The personnel of the men to whom these great funds are intrusted, without any public accounting being made, is also worthy of investigation.

#### ANDERSON OF NEW YORK—SHUPP OF MISSOURI.

You have before you the example of two outstanding leaders of the Anti-Saloon League—Anderson of New York and Shupp of Missouri.

Anderson has been sentenced to prison. You are familiar with the fantastic tales he told on the witness stand in his own defense—of how great sums of money came into his possession through mysterious "John T. Kings," and disappeared through equally mysterious "Henry Manns," none of whom left any records of their transactions.

The case of Shupp of Missouri is even more illuminating.

Standing as the champion of moral reform, he became the joint owner of a drug concern engaged in the unlawful sale of alcoholic liquors and narcotic drugs. He demanded and received fees for getting alcohol withdrawal and other permits from the prohibition enforcement department.

He demanded and received fees from brewers for getting the prohibition law enforced.

His pockets—and the pockets of his assistants—were filled with passes issued by a railroad corporation that for two decades controlled the political destinies of the State by the use of passes.

#### ANDERSON AND SHUPP INDORSED BY LEAGUE.

It should be borne in mind that in spite of the conviction of Anderson by a jury of his own selection, and of the exposure of Shupp, of Missouri, that since their exposure both have been fully indorsed by the boards of directors of their own State Anti-Saloon Leagues, and these indorsements never have been withdrawn.

The fact that State Anti-Saloon Leagues, through their boards of directors, publicly indorse such acts on the part of their leaders, should be a warning to the Congress of the United States.

Is it surprising when the two State Anti-Saloon Leagues give their uncompromising and unqualified indorsement to the Andersons and Shupps that the Anti-Saloon League management in Washington should exert every power and influence it possesses to prevent an uncovering of the scandals of prohibition enforcement?

#### BOOTLEGGING AT SEA AND THE LEAGUE.

One of the associations affiliated with this committee had the fact reported to Mr. Wheeler that the United States Shipping Board, controlled by the Government, had entered upon a great bootlegging enterprise on Government-owned and operated ships, but Mr. Wheeler made no move to stop it.

So long as this fact was concealed from the American public, Mr. Wheeler and the Anti-Saloon League gave themselves no concern about the violation of the prohibition law by the Government itself.

It was shown that Anderson in New York, one of the agents of the league that helped to maintain invisible Anti-Saloon League government, was paid \$15,000 a year in salary—exactly twice the salary paid to the Representatives in Congress of the visible government.

We make a demand for an investigation of the Anti-Saloon League with respect both to its financial control and its boasted control over chosen Representatives of the people.

We make a demand for an investigation of the Prohibition Enforcement Department, under Anti-Saloon League control, in order that an accounting may be made to the people of the administration of the prohibition law.

#### WHO RUNS CONGRESS, MEMBERS OR THE LEAGUE?

Call S. S. Kresge to the witness stand. Call the representatives of the great trusts that have contributed vast sums of money to the Anti-Saloon League. Call the "John T. Kings" who hide behind committees. Bare the facts and tell the people whether you, as the chosen Representatives of the Government, are running the legislative department of the Government, or whether the boast of the Anti-Saloon League is true that you are its pawns and move as the invisible influences behind the Anti-Saloon League direct you to move.

This committee pledges you its unreserved cooperation to bare the facts, and it will furnish you information, which, if followed up, will turn the light of day in dark places and destroy the sinister influences that are having such disastrous effect upon Government and undermining the confidence of the people in the Government they have established.

JAMES DUNCAN, Chairman,

THOMAS F. MAGUIRE, Executive Secretary,

Joint legislative committee for modifying the Volstead Act, representing the American Federation of Labor, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, Constitutional Liberty League of Massachusetts, the Moderation League (Inc.) for Modifying the National Prohibition Act.

DETROIT, December 5, 1923.

Mr. CHARLES L. KNOWER,

St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. KNOWER: This message is sent because of your interest in "good business."

A committee of 55 persons, called the manufacture and business committee of the Anti-Saloon League of America, began eight years ago to help the National Anti-Saloon League win and hold prohibition. A good many have assisted us. League men say our aid has been an essential factor for success. Now we are in the hot fight to uphold flag and law and finish the job. More help is needed. We need you!

Besides the State organizations, the national division of the Anti-Saloon League, under separate budget, has 200 employees who keep the organization everywhere strong and by voice and print do tremendous educational service. In its legal, legislative, and law enforcement departments it stimulates and backs up enforcement of the law throughout the Nation. Additional contributions are urgently required for current expenses and for the special work for 1924 now begun, including the big convention at Washington in January, for publicity and public sentiment.

Even if you assist this work in your own State, it is increasingly and vitally necessary that those who have a business interest like the members of this committee and you shall strongly help the national organization also. Knowing from close touch the national efficiency and needs, besides helping in the Michigan league I have personally given during the past year \$10,000 to the national league as a "good business" investment.

Your assistance was never more needed than right now. Please give personal and special attention to this and send a check for \$1,000, \$500, \$250, or \$100, which will suitably indicate your desire to keep the liquor "bloodsucker" off decent trade. Read the inclosed copy of Roger Babson's letter to Mr. Russell, the secretary of this committee, and then mail your check payable to Foster Copeland, treasurer, or to S. S. Kresge, chairman, in the inclosed envelope. Our committee will appreciate your cooperation.

Yours for the protection of law, S. S. KRESGE,  
Chairman Manufacture and Business Committee.

(This letter reveals that the Anti-Saloon League, while masquerading as the political representative of the Christian churches, is really the representative of big business interests that finance it for "good business" only. Kresge's income—approximately \$10,000,000 a year—contributes thousands to control public morals, but wife charged that he refused to accept any responsibility for education and training of his own children. Fifty-five "John T. Kings" hidden behind the manufacture and business committee of the Anti-Saloon League.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Gentlemen, I am very glad to have an opportunity to vote for an increase of the teachers' pay in the District of Columbia. I believe that the teachers in our schools should be well paid everywhere. I have always been a friend of the teachers and a believer that they were entitled to better compensation than they receive, but I do not want to vote for this \$10,000 salary for the superintendent of schools. Every bill that comes to Congress now seems to carry a salary of \$10,000 or \$12,000. I feel that we are overdoing the matter in the way of big salaries in this country, and if I get an opportunity, and I will, I am going to vote to reduce the salary below \$10,000 for the superintendent of schools, because I think that is too large.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman vote for \$8,000?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes; and I will vote for \$7,500 if I get a chance.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not believe by comparison we can reach a proper criterion for the pay of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia. A number of gentlemen, including my friend from Texas, have compared the salaries as set out in this bill with the salaries paid for the governors in the different States. Well, I will say to my friends, when they stop and think a minute, they will see the fallacy of such comparisons. The Governor of the State of Virginia gets \$5,000 a year. Our superintendent of highways gets \$12,000. The city manager of Roanoke, Va., with a population of 60,000 people, gets \$6,000, and yet the Governor of the State gets only \$5,000 a year. I think the manager of the city of Norfolk gets \$15,000. So I submit, my friends, that is not a proper criterion. You know that many men can handshake themselves into a public office; we know that; but when you go to find the man with the mental, physical, and moral equipment that fits him to be the head of an educational organization such as you have here in the District of Columbia, you have got to have a man who, in my judgment, is worth a good salary. I am frank to say to you if the salary is going to remain at \$7,500 or \$8,000 for a while I think that is a good idea. It strikes me that \$10,000 is a pretty big jump, when he is now getting \$6,000. I deny that it is governmental economy to try to be stingy about the matter of educating the youth of this Nation. America is a great Nation, and why, not because of its gold, not because of its mines, not because of its territory, but because of the character of the men and women who blazed the trail of civilization through the forests of this country. [Applause.] That is the reason America is

a great Nation. It was the ringing of the school bell, the peal of the church organ that blazed the path of American progress. Let me say this to you, if America is to continue to be a great and a free people and is to take her place as the leader of Nations, then the children of to-day, who will be the men and women of to-morrow, are better equipped to discharge the duties of citizenship than you or I. We should do everything to make them better men and women. I give you this thought from Socrates of years ago. He said, "If I could climb to the highest peak in Athens I would proclaim aloud, 'Oh, my fellow citizens; why do you scrape the rocks for gold and neglect your children to whom you must ere long relinquish it all.'"

And so, my friends, a dollar well spent in educating a boy or girl—and I speak of education in its broader sense, educating not only the mind and intellect, but the spirit, and building the character of the child—is the best dollar you can spend of governmental money.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. These high prices and low prices paid to teachers elsewhere may not be a perfect criterion. I agree with the gentleman. But in this age of competition should not the Congress take into consideration the higher salaries paid elsewhere in fixing the salaries here, since the teachers might be lured away by offers of better-paid positions elsewhere?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think Congress should take into consideration the low salaries in other places. I do not know of a place—certainly in my own State and other States—where the school-teacher, the person who has the function largely of shaping the life and character of the boy or girl, and in many instances more instrumental for good than the parents—many times the school-teacher will see the child and have more influence in forming his character and shaping his future than the parents.

I do not think we pay enough. When you go out and hire a man or woman who is mentally and morally equipped to take up this greatest of all tasks, they ought to be adequately paid. We want better men and better women. We should want more honesty and morality in public men and in men who take public office.

How can we have such a condition? By raising up a generation of better men and women. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, speaking of honesty, and citizenship, and public office, I desire to take this opportunity to make a few observations which I hope shall not be entirely out of place at this time. I use the term "observations" advisedly, as what I shall have to say will be not in a spirit of criticism or prompted by partisan feeling. Mr. Chairman, I shall digress just a little with the indulgence of the committee.

I said to my constituents before coming to Congress that while I was a Democrat, and believed in the tenets and principles of the great party; and that while I should always endeavor to hold up its standard, when that standard was hoisted in the cause of right, yet I said that I regretted the tendency of both parties in too often allowing their zeal as party champions to overshadow, and sway their better and saner judgment as Representatives of the people. In the heat of the fray we of both parties too often forget that after all what the great masses of American citizens are most interested in is a constructive legislative program that will meet the needs of the varied and complex social and business life of America.

The average American citizen loves to see a good, lively, spirited, political campaign, and especially when it is conducted on a high plane and involves great and fundamental issues. They love to participate in such scraps. They like at election time to pick a candidate and a cause, and with characteristic American enthusiasm espouse the cause of their choice with might and main. But there is a time for partisan politics and a time for legislative action.

And so it is that the two great parties represented in the political life of the Nation vie with each other from time to time, each claiming to be the party best fitted by material, and best suited by tradition to reflect in the affairs of statecraft the hopes, the ambitions, and the ideals of this great people. I believe in government by political parties. I can imagine no other way in which the fundamentals of our American form of Government might find expression, yet I say again that the first, the foremost, and greatest duty of every man who takes the oath of a representative in either branch of the American Congress is to see to it as best he can that the legislative needs of the Nation are not neglected and passed by in our party fights. Country first. Party next.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a day of investigations. Everybody who is not investigating is being investigated. And



on we go. But let us not forget that our constituents are expecting, aye, demanding that certain great legislative needs shall have the consideration of their Representatives.

It can not be rightfully said that the present Congress has wholly failed to function. Its usefulness has been greatly handicapped, it is true, because of the impotence of the party in power. The Republican Party has a majority in both branches of the Congress. Both Houses are organized under Republican leadership. The legislative program of both bodies is wholly and entirely in the hands and under the control of the Republican Party. All legislation upon the floor of either body is engineered by a steering committee controlled by that party. Every committee of both branches has thereon a majority of Republicans and can report out a bill at its will. Their steering committee can bring that bill upon the floor for action at any time. And so if there has been a failure—and there has been to some extent—to function, is it not properly and justly chargeable to the party into whose hands the people of America in 1920 placed the power of Government?

Yet, notwithstanding this condition, substantial progress has been made in the passage of legislation in the House up to this time. A number of great appropriation bills have been passed. Absolutely no partisan effort on the part of the minority to delay the passage, or to embarrass the administration in the passage of these measures.

A revenue bill has been passed by the House. And although there is a wide difference of opinion about its merit, yet if it can become a law as passed by the House it will give to the people a substantial reduction in their Federal tax burden and a 25 per cent reduction on the 1923 Federal taxes, which to my mind is so desirable at this time.

Consideration was given a measure to submit to the States an amendment to the Federal Constitution to prohibit the further issuance of tax-exempt securities. This was a live question, ably debated, and defeated by a nonpartisan vote.

A so-called adjusted compensation measure was called up. The gag rule was applied by the party in power, all debate shut off, and the right to amend denied, and voted through by the advocates of adjusted compensation with a prayer upon their lips that the Senate would absolutely rewrite it.

The Muscle Shoals bill was debated and passed by an overwhelming nonpartisan vote—this measure that means so much to the farmers of the country.

And a number of other important pieces of legislation have been considered by the House, and now await action by the other branch of the Congress.

But all the time we are investigating and being investigated. What has come of it?

Well, some months ago this Nation was shaken from center to circumference by the revelations that the great oil reserves of the Nation, to which we must look for fuel for the Navy of the Nation in time of emergency, had been handed over to be exploited by private interests. A former Republican Secretary of the Interior had not been able to stand up against the temptings of private interests, and had, for a consideration, been false to his high duty as a Cabinet officer. A Republican Secretary of the Navy, either because of a fraudulent purpose, or abstract stupidity—and I believe the latter—who was the legal custodian of this public domain, had at least acquiesced in this great fraud against the rights of the American people. When confronted with his wrong, he said if he had the chance he would do it again. He will not have the chance.

A Republican Attorney General, long under suspicion before the bar of American public opinion; the veritable thorn in the flesh of the conscientious members of his party; a millstone around the neck of his party in power; the boon companion of crooks and bribers of all descriptions, and no longer trusted by his President, has gone down before the irresistible power that was gradually crushing him out of power, and that would have carried down all who tried to hold him up.

What is the net result of it all? What is the popular reaction to the investigations to date?

The investigations have shown a condition to exist in the high places of government never thought of in the wildest dreams of those who are ever too ready to suspect and question all public men. They have forced out of public life men who had not measured up to the high standard of honesty and integrity in public affairs, although picked from among "the best minds." Has this not been a service to the American people? Have we not written "that those who run may read"? I think we have.

Yet we are told that there are to be other investigations, and so on, and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I, as a Democrat, make bold to venture the suggestion that it might be possible to go to the extreme in the matter of investigations, just as you can go to extremes in most other things, even though the end sought might be ever so worthy. Of course, if anyone has violated the law he ought to be indicted and prosecuted for it; and impeached if he is an officeholder, no matter to which party he may belong. But what are we going to accomplish if we keep it up?

Well, we are told we will drive out all the rest of the members of the Cabinet. Well, in the first place I doubt it. In the second place I believe we ought from now on give more time and thought to the legislative needs of the Nation. Let us apply our talent and our serious thought and our eloquence in meeting and attempting to solve some of the great problems pending before Congress and which the people want us to consider and pass on. We have demonstrated beyond any possible question that the people made a great mistake four years ago, and that there ought to be a housecleaning upstairs and downstairs; but let us not be selfish about the matter and put them all out. Let us wait until November and give the great electorate of America a chance to help in the cleaning.

There are some measures pending before Congress that certainly should have its consideration and action before adjournment. There are many of them, but there comes to my mind the great immigration bill, in the passage of which the people are so much interested. The educational bill; several constitutional amendments that many of our citizens are interested in and have a right to an expression from Congress one way or the other. And still others. Some affecting the agricultural interests; the bill affecting the salary raise for postal employees, and the bill liberalizing the retirement act. All these and still others. Let us get down to it and leave it to the intelligence of the voting public of America to finish the housecleaning in November, which I sincerely believe they will do unless we, blinded by partisan desire, shall convince them that they could expect little better from the Democratic Party, should they be given the power to govern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in the very limited time allowed me I wish to urge the House to pass this bill which provides for an increase in the salaries of the teachers of the District of Columbia. In my judgment, no more important measure affecting the welfare of this great and beautiful city of Washington can be considered by this House. Nothing can be of more concern to this city than the education of her children. Into our hands is committed the trust of providing for the education of these children. We can not, we must not fall in this trust. Ours is the duty to see that every child in this city is afforded the opportunity to be trained and prepared and educated. Ours is the high privilege to give to the child, made in the divine likeness and holding that inestimable treasure which many of us have lost, that one priceless treasure, the future, a man's chance to win in the battle of life. [Applause.]

Education is a sham, a cheat unless carried on by able, accomplished teachers. The whole worth of a school lies in the teacher. As water can not rise higher than its source, so a class can not be better than its teacher. Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* tells us that before the invention of the art of printing, a scholar and a beggar were terms very nearly synonymous. Before that time the governors of the different universities appear to have often granted licenses to their teachers to beg. As I have looked over the salaries that have been paid the teachers of the District of Columbia during the past years, I have not doubted but that these teachers have thought that we were about to return to those bad old days.

The evidence submitted to the committee reporting this bill shows that the salaries in Washington are much lower than they are in other cities of similar size—in fact, the compensation paid teachers in the District of Columbia is so much

lower than the salaries paid in other cities that Washington can not compete with other cities in securing and retaining efficient teachers. A laborer is worthy of his hire, and if you do not pay him, you can not get him. Reports to the National Education Association show the following:

TEACHERS OF GRADES 1 TO GRADES VIII.

Maximum salaries: With the present Washington salary and using the smallest amounts wherever maximum is not a single amount, 64 of the 66 cities reporting pay more than Washington and 1 pays less, as a maximum.

With the present Washington salary and using the largest amounts wherever maximum is not a single amount, 55 of the 66 cities reporting pay more than Washington, 1 city pays the same, and 9 cities pay less, as a maximum.

This is but an example of the discrepancy between the salaries paid the teachers of the District of Columbia and the salaries paid the teachers of the other large cities of the country. Compare the minimum salaries or the maximum salaries, compare the elementary-school salaries or the junior high school salaries or the high-school salaries or the principals' salaries or the superintendents' salaries and the discrepancy will be very largely the same. In his testimony before the committee Doctor Ballou, the superintendent of the Washington schools, told of the great difficulty experienced in securing teachers for Washington on account of the low and inadequate salaries. He called attention to the fact that in 1922 out of 22 persons who had taken the examination and qualified to teach in the District of Columbia only 6 answered the inquiries as to whether or not they would accept an appointment, and that only 1 of the 22 would accept an appointment. If we consider the relative position of the States and the District of Columbia and their ability to educate their children, we find that the District of Columbia ranks first in income per child and that it ranks forty-second in per cent of income expended for education.

Let me remind you, gentlemen, that since 1913 the increase in the cost of living has been 52 per cent and the increase in the salaries of teachers has been only from 10 to 20 per cent. There are those who charge that education is costing too much. Education is costing this country each year approximately \$1,036,000,000. This is only 2.13 per cent of the country's total income. The Nation spends vastly greater sums than this for other purposes; for example, according to the statistics of the National Education Association \$17,338,000,000 is annually expended by the people of this country for luxuries. Of this amount over \$2,000,000,000 is spent for tobacco alone. We spend nearly twice as much for tobacco as we do for all our public schools. Several years ago the United States Commissioner of Education estimated that 5 per cent interest on the money we expended to win the war would be a quarter of a billion dollars more than would be necessary to give to America a first-rate public-school system.

The salaries of the teachers in Washington are miserably low, but nowhere in this country are the salaries of teachers up to that standard that they should be. The teacher is like the soldier. You can not compensate the soldier for his service. You can not compensate the teacher for his service. The service is too great. You can merely give the teacher a salary that will permit him to serve, and I will never be satisfied until we pay the teachers of this country a salary that will enable them to live as their position in the community demands; that will enable them to carry on their work by study and by travel in the summer; and that will enable them to prepare financially for their old age. [Applause.]

The passage of this bill gives to us an opportunity to dignify the teaching profession in the Capital of the Nation to the end that a reasonable standard of pay for teachers may be established for the whole country. I wish to call your attention to the following resolutions, passed by the National Education Association and by the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association:

[Excerpt from resolutions of the National Education Association, Oakland, Calif., July 6, 1923.]

"We should be able to find in the city of Washington, the Capital of the Nation, leadership in matters concerning school administration, supervision, teaching, business management, and for the promulgation of a far-seeing and adequate educational program for city schools.

"The schools of the Capital City belong to the Nation, and for this reason we urge Congress to create a board of education for the city of Washington which shall be absolutely free from party control, which shall have entire control of its financial budget, and which shall have an adequate financial income to maintain schools of which the Nation may be proud."

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct extract from the resolutions adopted by the National Education Association, July 6, 1923, at Oakland, Calif.

J. W. CRABTREE, Secretary.

[Excerpt from resolutions of the department of superintendence of the National Education Association, Cleveland, Ohio, March 1, 1923.]

"We note with satisfaction and heartily indorse the expressed intention of Congress to make the school system of Washington the model school system of the country. We pledge to Congress our hearty support of this proposed legislation and of such appropriation of funds as may be necessary to provide in the National Capital a system of public education which shall exemplify to the Nation the best in administration, supervision, business management, and teaching service. To this end we urge the immediate passage of the teachers' salary bill now pending before Congress."

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct extract from the resolutions adopted by the department of superintendence March 1, 1923, at Cleveland, Ohio.

S. D. SHANKLAND, Executive Secretary.

It was my privilege as the president of the board of education of the city of Montgomery, Ala., to attend the annual meeting of the department of superintendence held in Atlantic City in February, 1921. At that time there was scarcely a paper or a periodical in America that was not indicting the American people for the meager and unjust salaries that were being paid our teachers. And yet, although that meeting was a continual discussion of the educational problems of the day I heard not one word of complaint, not one word of protest, not one word of condemnation by any educator of the mere pittance that was being paid the teachers of this country for their service to the Nation. The predominant note sounded by those educators was their fine understanding of the service which is theirs and their high consecration to that service. The whole meeting was so free from the taint of private interest or personal preference. There were no selfish aims subserved, no partisanship furthered. The atmosphere of the meeting was surcharged with Americanism, an Americanism potential with sacrifice, an Americanism vibrant in its democracy, and 100 per cent in its adherence to the precepts of the Republic. All seemed shot through with the idea to give something to the country. I thrilled beneath the spell of the nobility of that gathering and as I sat there in that great convention hall with those six or seven thousand men and women, representing the half million and more teachers of this Nation, it filled my imagination as I thought of them busy every day and every night, busy with a great eagerness to show some little stranger the right road, busy with a forgetfulness of their own comforts, pleasures, and fortunes, giving of themselves to bring light to the minds and the hearts of our people—servants come from God. [Applause.]

These are the men and women into whose hands is intrusted the molding of the citizenship of the morrow. It is to these men and women that we must look for the future American. The public school is making ready those who in the years to come are to uphold the pillars of the Nation. From its crucible will be poured the warp and the woof of our national life. It is the bulwark of the Republic. It is the great enterprise of the Nation. There is nowhere in this land any home so humble that it may not send its children to enter beneath the portals of the public school and there stand the peer of all. The public school pays no tribute to aristocracy, subscribes to no creed or caste, renders fealty to no monarch or master of any name or kind. It is no snob, and holds in its warm embrace all of its little sons and daughters. It is of the very stuff of opportunity. It is triumphant in its embodiment of the principles of the Republic. The teachers are the torch-bearers of the Republic. Without them the school is a meaningless shell decaying unto dust; with them it is a mighty living, moving thing. What the soul is to the body of man the teacher is to the school. [Applause.]

Here in the Capital of the Nation, in this body representing a great and grateful people, let us be just to our teachers and let us set an example for the guidance of the Nation to the end that our schools may be great, strong, and true. More than this we are not asked; less than this we can not do. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.



Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen. I wish you would give me your attention for a moment. You want to understand this bill, and I want to call your attention to the fact that the longevity allowance is granted in this bill. I call your attention to page 10, line 12 and on down:

*Provided*, That under the provisions of this section the present compensation of any teacher, school officer, or other employee shall be constructed to include basic salary, longevity allowance, session-room allowance, and increase of compensation (bonus): *Provided further*, That teachers and other employees assigned to classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the foregoing schedule shall be entitled to longevity placement as provided in section 6.

Now, in section 6 it is provided—

Sec. 6. That teachers, school officers, and other employees in the service of the Board of Education on July 1, 1924, shall be placed in the salary classes and positions of the foregoing schedule as follows:

Now, let me read to you a little further.

*Provided further*, That all teachers, school officers, or other employees hereafter appointed, shall be placed in the salary classes and positions in the foregoing schedule by the said board, and all teachers and other employees assigned to classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the foregoing schedule in the service of the said board on July 1, 1924, or thereafter appointed shall receive their longevity increase according to their previous number of years of experience in teaching in like positions in accredited schools to those which they hold on July 1, 1924, or to which they may thereafter be appointed:

Then it provides that service in the Army and Navy shall be the same as actual school service in teaching in granting this longevity allowance. Now, there is no question about the teachers, and I would not have it otherwise. Each teacher is entitled to a basic salary of so much and \$100 each for 10 years. Suppose a teacher has taught for 10 years? She should be entitled to her longevity allowance. She ought to begin with the maximum salary; that is fair, and I would not have it any other way. I would contend for it if it were not already in the bill, but it is in the bill, and a teacher who has taught 10 years will begin with the maximum salary provided in this bill. There is no question about it.

Now, the point I made was this: There is nothing in the bill which keeps the officers from beginning with the maximum salary provided in the bill when they have already served the required number of years, and you can not find one word in this bill which will prevent every officer in the school force from beginning with the maximum salary. It is simply a question of construction and I would not have that otherwise. Say a school superintendent has been superintendent for five years or even three years, and you provide in the bill a basic salary of \$8,000, and \$1,000 for succeeding years of service. Why should he not begin with the \$10,000, if he has had the proper longevity experience in teaching or in acting as superintendent?

Now, I want to submit this to you: You think it is awfully easy for a teacher to get a position in Washington; you think that positions are being vacated, that teachers are quitting and going elsewhere to places where larger salaries are paid, but I want to give you a little experience I had.

A young lady came here and asked me to help her get a position in the schools. I helped her make application to the superintendent for a position. She was a bachelor of arts from the University of Texas and had taken her arts degree there; she was a Phi Beta Kappa and wore her key when she went to see the superintendent. She was a graduate of the State normal school for teachers; she had her certificate of graduation from that school. She had taught for three years in an approved high school, if you please, and yet it took several months for me to even get her located as a temporary teacher, without any permanent position but merely a temporary teacher with no regular position at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, the people of the State of New York have insisted on their legislators giving them expert teachers through the medium of decent salaries and excellent training. I voted in the New York State Senate for the first equal pay bill and again for the increase in salary bill of 1920, about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has spoken. As a result of this New York State, according to the charts prepared by the National Education Association, stands first in the list of States in the matter of the pay of teachers.

I believe the people in my State want their Representatives to show the teachers of the District the same consideration which we showed to our own teachers, for, after all, the people of our State recognize that the people of the District, without a vote but with a tax, are entitled to decent and honest government from us, the same government which we accord to our own people.

According to city school leaflet No. 15, prepared by the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Education, the salaries in the District of Columbia for the elementary grades run from \$1,200 to \$1,600 a year, while in Chicago they run from \$1,500 to \$2,600, and in New York from \$1,500 to \$2,875. Now, this disparity is great, and I do not think anybody will claim that New York City or Chicago are paying too much.

Then, the next question which confronts us is: Are the teachers of the District and the officials of this District entitled to the increases which are asked for in this bill? While Washington stands twenty-third among the cities of 100,000 or over in the matter of pay of salaries to teachers, Washington stands, according to the charts prepared by the National Education Association, first in the matter of information on public questions shown by its children, second in the matter of educational attainment shown by its children, and third in the matter of public-school efficiency. This is a marvelous comparison, and I submit that the teachers and supervisory officials who are responsible for this high rank in efficiency should get great consideration from this Congress.

I certainly believe that if the people of the city of Washington had the home rule to which they are entitled, and if they had presented to them the fact that although their teachers are paid a ridiculous salary they have managed to keep their schools in the very first ranks in the matter of efficiency, that the people of this city would vote for these increases.

Money given the public-school teachers is money given to the children of the schools. A cultured, contented teacher means cultured, contented children. [Applause.] Self-instruction, added culture, and added contentment come to the teacher with added income. As the report of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching for 1923 points out, the schools, while primarily intellectual agencies, are inevitably, if they are sincere, agencies for the building of the character of the children; and a teacher in the right frame of mind will build up the character of the pupils, but the teacher dissatisfied and discontented will unconsciously debilitate the minds and morality of the children.

The children in the schools of Washington are, after all, the children of the various States, and they are going back at some time or other to the various States; and I believe it is the duty of the Federal Government, under these circumstances and under the peculiar relationship that exists between the District, the States, and the Federal Government, to see to it that the children in this District get the best possible education through the medium of the best possible salaries to the teachers. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I suppose there is no investment which can be made by the public that yields as good returns as a proper investment for the education of our children, and I have always been of the opinion that those who are engaged in the work of teaching are doing as patriotic a service as the men who are fighting on the battle line. There is very little hope of reward for those who do the rank and file work in the educational field. Occasionally somebody gets to be a superintendent. Of course, there are few superintendents in comparison with the total number of teachers.

I am not sufficiently informed on the merits of this bill to give an intelligent opinion about its justice or whether the compensation sought to be paid is excessive or whether the compensation is not more than adequate. I have some doubt about the language of the bill. It looks to me as if it might be retroactive in some respects. If it is, it ought not to be passed in that form. It is proposed here to pay teachers a basic salary and to pay superintendents basic salaries and to pay principals basic salaries, with further increments to those salaries as time goes on. It does not say whether the number of years required of a teacher shall be 10 years after the bill is passed or whether it shall be 10 years counting the time before the bill is passed, before these additional amounts shall become effective.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman listen to this language of the bill: That on and after July 1, 1924.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. DOWELL. I think language could not be clearer.

Mr. MADDEN. It says that after July 1 these salaries become effective.

Mr. DOWELL. And then its provisions provide for the increases as they progress.

Mr. MADDEN. I think, however, that is simply to make it conform to the fiscal year when the appropriations become available. I have some doubt whether that does not become retroactive as to the additional compensation. If it does, I am opposed to the retroactive feature of it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman that the language of the bill is indefinite, especially when all of its provisions are considered, but what good reasons can be assigned why a teacher or a superintendent heretofore employed in the District schools should not have the benefit of increased pay by reason of such service?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, they have been getting longevity pay all the time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I ask the gentleman this further question? When we came to write the classification bill for the Postal Service, my recollection is that service prior to the time of such classification was given credit for. The same was true when we came to write the pay bill for the Army and the Navy.

Mr. MADDEN. I think not in the Postal Service. I helped to write that bill. What we did do in the Postal Service was this: We increased the entrance pay; that is, the grade that was drawing a smaller rate drew a larger rate.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] is correct. For example, if a man was in grade 5 of the Postal Service, when the new salary range was made he was transferred to grade 5 in the new range.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true, and that is just what I said. We increased the entrance pay.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. That amounted, of course, to giving him the benefit of his prior service.

Mr. MADDEN. We made the entrance pay larger.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And unquestionably, when we passed the increase pay bill for the allied military services last year, we gave the benefit of all increases to those who had performed previous service.

Mr. MADDEN. And these people have been getting their longevity also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois two more minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I rose principally, however, to say this: I do not know anything much about the qualifications of the superintendent of the schools here, but that is due to my own lack of opportunity to study his qualifications. He may be the best man in the world, but I think \$10,000 a year is more than ought to be paid to a superintendent of schools in a city of this class. No superintendent of schools here ought to get more than \$7,500 a year. That is all the salary ought to be, not only now but at any time, while the population remains substantially what it is. Why should the superintendent of schools here get \$2,500 a year more than a Member of Congress. Is there any reason why he should?

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Is he required to know any more?

Mr. DOWELL. The superintendent of schools in the city of Chicago gets—

Mr. MADDEN. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. DOWELL. Twelve thousand dollars a year, as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. The last time I heard about the salary it was \$10,000, but it may have been increased. I do not know about that; but even if it has been increased to \$12,000, certainly there is no comparison between the superintendency of schools here and the superintendency of schools there.

Mr. BLANTON. It is five times as large.

Mr. MADDEN. It is more than five times; it is eight times as large, and the responsibilities are eight times as great.

Mr. GASQUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GASQUE. Does the gentleman think that a member of the Railway Labor Board or a member of the Shipping Board should get more than the superintendent of schools here?

Mr. MADDEN. The members of the Shipping Board are only getting \$7,500 a year.

Mr. GASQUE. A bill has been proposed here increasing it to \$10,000.

Mr. MADDEN. They may propose all the bills they like, but that does not mean they are going to be passed. I am opposed to making this salary more than \$7,500, and I hope we will have enough votes here to stop it from going any higher than that.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. May I inquire whether the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has consumed all his time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Unfortunately, yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LARSON].

Mr. LARSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not given to loquacity on the floor of this House. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will bear out the truth of that statement. The more I see of the workings of Congress the less confidence I have in the efficiency of "government by talk." I have come to the conclusion that it is one of the chief weaknesses of Congress—too much mere talk for home consumption and too little action for the Nation.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why does not the gentleman give less of it?

Mr. LARSON of Minnesota. You have given too much already, my friend. [Laughter.]

Reluctant as I am to talk, I can not remain silent when I hear objections pressed against so meritorious a measure as the one we are now considering. I am enthusiastically for it and every provision of it. This bill should pass without a dissenting voice.

We are considering a matter that has to do with the very foundation of our Government—public-school education—which the founders of this Nation, Washington particularly, urged us, to whom this country was given as a legacy, to encourage and foster. They understood the vital importance of an intelligent and educated citizenry to the welfare of our country and the perpetuity of our institutions.

In the great Ordinance of 1787 for the Northwest Territory, out of which a part of my own State of Minnesota was carved, the fathers said: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

We have tried to follow that sound advice of the founders, but we have not fully measured up to our responsibilities in the matter of furnishing an adequate system of public-school education to the youth of our land. The disclosures made by draft records shock our national pride. They have aroused, I hope, our conscience. They showed that in this land of promise we have an amazingly large number of illiterates, native as well as foreign born. They revealed the humiliating fact that our percentage of illiteracy is much higher than that of the small and poor countries of Europe. We must remove that disgrace from our national escutcheon.

Let us start right here in the Nation's Capital to make good our erstwhile boast that our free public-school system is the best and most efficient in the world.

The keystone of any school system is the teacher. Commodious, well-ventilated, well-lighted, sanitary school buildings are good, but, after all, the teacher is the school. I think it was Garfield who once said that Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and a pupil at the other end constituted a college. He was right.

But, Mr. Chairman, how can we secure and retain efficient, well-trained, mature, and devoted teachers unless we pay them adequate salaries? And by adequate salaries I mean such as "will provide a comfortable subsistence, afford some compensation for money invested in professional training, furnish means for continued professional improvement, and also a reasonable margin for saving, which is properly regarded as an obligation of citizenship."

We do not require the testimony of an economic expert to prove to us that the cost of living is such here in Washington that salaries less than those provided in this bill do not meet the requirements.

We can not afford to be penurious and stingy in furnishing our children an education. If we must scrimp, let us not do it at the sacrifice of our children's education by being miserly with those who are consecrating themselves to the patriotic



duty of developing them into honest, loyal, intelligent, law-abiding, and self-supporting American citizens.

As for the salary of the superintendent, my opinion is that if the man who occupies that exacting and important executive position is not worthy of \$10,000 a year the appointive power should find a man who is worthy. It is false economy to have a mediocre at the head of such a great school system as we should have in the Nation's Capital. In voting on this important measure let us bear in mind that "the safety of the Republic rests to a large degree with the teachers of the Nation." [Applause.]

Now, as to comparing the salary of the superintendent of schools with the salary of a Congressman, I want to say that the salary of \$7,500 for a Congressman is not enough. If I had my way I would place the salary of a Congressman at \$12,000 and reduce by one-half the membership of this House. [Applause.] In my judgment the country would then have better legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That on and after July 1, 1924, the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall be as follows:

#### ARTICLE I.—SALARIES OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL LIBRARIANS.

##### CLASS 1. TEACHERS IN KINDERGARTENS AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,600 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 2. TEACHERS IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.

A teacher in the junior high schools who possesses the eligibility requirements of teachers in the elementary schools and who in addition has met the higher eligibility requirements established by the Board of Education for teachers in junior high schools shall be paid in accordance with the following schedules:

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,600 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,400 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

A teacher in the junior high school who possesses the eligibility requirements of teachers in the senior high and normal schools shall be paid in accordance with the following schedules:

Group C. A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for ten years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group D. A basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 3. TEACHERS IN SENIOR HIGH AND NORMAL SCHOOLS.

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for ten years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 4. SCHOOL LIBRARIANS.

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,600 per year is reached.

#### ARTICLE II.—SALARIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY OFFICERS.

##### CLASS 5.—TEACHING PRINCIPALS WITH FROM FOUR TO SEVEN ROOMS—PRINCIPALS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

A basic salary of \$2,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,600 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 6.—TEACHING PRINCIPALS WITH FROM 8 TO 15 ROOMS.

A basic salary of \$2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 7.—ADMINISTRATIVE PRINCIPALS WITH 16 ROOMS OR MORE, AND PRINCIPALS OF VOCATIONAL AND AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS.

A basic salary of \$2,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 8.—PRINCIPALS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.

A basic salary of \$3,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,000 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 9.—PRINCIPALS OF SENIOR HIGH AND NORMAL SCHOOLS.

A basic salary of \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,500 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 10.—DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL SUBJECTS AND DEPARTMENTS.

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,500 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 11.—HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS.

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,700 per year is reached.

##### CLASS 12.—SUPERVISING PRINCIPALS.

A basic salary of \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,500 per year is reached.

##### COMMUNITY CENTER DEPARTMENT.

###### A. DIRECTOR.

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,500 per year is reached.

###### B. GENERAL SECRETARIES.

A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

###### C. COMMUNITY SECRETARIES.

A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$1,700 per year is reached.

##### DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND WORK PERMITS.

###### A. DIRECTOR.

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,500 per year is reached.

###### B. CHIEF ATTENDANCE OFFICERS.

A basic salary of \$2,100 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for four years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,500 per year is reached.

###### C. ATTENDANCE OFFICERS.

A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for six years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,000 per year is reached.

###### D. CENSUS INSPECTORS.

A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for six years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,000 per year is reached.

##### BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR WHITE SCHOOLS.

###### CHIEF EXAMINER.

A basic salary of \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,500 per year is reached.

###### ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS.

A basic salary of \$4,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,700 per year is reached.

###### FIRST ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS.

A basic salary of \$4,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$5,000 per year is reached.

###### SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS.

A basic salary of \$8,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$1,000 for two years, or until a maximum salary of \$10,000 per year is reached.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 1, strike out the words "For white schools."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard against the committee amendment. I would like to have my colleagues

understand this amendment. You are here providing, as proposed by the members of the committee, that a salary of \$4,500 a year shall be paid to the board of examiners of the District. Forty-five hundred dollars a year is a pretty big salary for them with what experience they have had in life, the number of years they have spent in preparing themselves to be examiners. I worked quite a number of years for \$3,000 a year as a trial judge, and I think I gave the best there was in me to that work. The circuit judges all over the United States in most of your States, the circuit trial judges in your home States, who try men for their lives, who try property rights involving millions of dollars, do not now get over \$4,000 a year. Most of them do not now get but \$3,000, and here you are proposing to pay these examiners, white and colored, by this amendment \$4,500.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Does the gentleman think the judges of whom he speaks get enough salary?

Mr. BLANTON. The people at home think so.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Does the gentleman think so?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say this to my distinguished four-minute orator from the great West, that when you find salaries ranging from \$3,000 to \$5,000 they are fixed by the people; when you find big salaries ranging from \$10,000 to \$15,000, \$20,000, and \$25,000, they are fixed by legislators and not by the people.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to answer it. What is it? [Laughter.]

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Does the gentleman think that the judges of whom he speaks are adequately paid for their work?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know. I know that at every election there are numerous lawyers trying to get their jobs away from them. I am against this amendment, and I think it ought to be voted down.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members of the committee that I am rather surprised at the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], a member of the subcommittee that reported this bill, and who should be familiar with this section of the bill. If the members will examine this amendment they will see that it is not a part of the bill, but it is simply a heading for a section of the bill. Here is a board of examiners, and if you will turn to page 18 of the bill you will find what the board of examiners really is. Section 13 provides:

That boards of examiners for carrying out the provisions of the statutes with reference to examinations of teachers shall consist of the superintendent of schools and not less than four nor more than six members of the supervisory or teaching staff of the white schools for the white schools and of the superintendent of schools and not less than four nor more than six members of the supervisory or teaching staff of the colored schools for the colored schools. The designations of members of the supervisory or teaching staff for membership on these boards shall be made annually by the Board of Education on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools.

Then section 14 says:

That there shall be appointed by the Board of Education, on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, a chief examiner for the board of examiners for white schools: *Provided*, That an assistant superintendent in the colored schools shall be designated by the superintendent of schools as chief examiner for the board of examiners for the colored schools: *Provided further*, That, except as herein otherwise provided, all members of the respective boards of examiners shall serve without additional compensation.

This bill does create an additional examiner, who will serve as secretary and aid to the examining board and superintendent of schools, but it is specifically provided in the bill that the colored examiner shall serve without additional compensation and shall be assistant superintendent of the colored schools. The amendment does not change the language of the bill one iota. It is simply in the heading or caption and is not in the body of the bill at all.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. How many examinations are there a year? In my State there are only two in a year.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, examinations are being held continually.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I know that in Washington it is almost continuous, but there are very few vacancies. Can the gentleman give us some idea as to the amount of work these persons would have to perform? Taking other States with

which I am familiar, there are not to exceed two examinations in a year, each taking about three weeks, which would be a total of six weeks. Does the gentleman mean to say that we should pay \$4,000 to this man for six weeks' work?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, no; this chief examiner, which was advocated by the school board, will serve as a secretary and an assistant to the two boards.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. But the school boards up here are not elected as they are in Maryland, and they can advocate some things that the school boards of the gentleman's home and mine would not advocate.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It was shown to the satisfaction of the members of the committee that this additional help was necessary. There is only one extra position created. I am opposed to the position that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] takes, who states that a colored examiner is created by this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Of course, it is absurd that there ought to be no examiners for any but the white schools. That is what this proposes if the amendment is not adopted. The amendment ought to be adopted without any question. A board of examiners is all that ought to be provided for. It ought not to say a board of examiners for white schools, with no provision whatever for the colored schools. There ought not to be any discrimination in the matter. A board of examiners ought to be provided, and then the people who are to be the examiners are provided further in the bill. We ought not to say simply a board of examiners for white schools. We have both classes of schools here in the District and both should be provided with examiners. All you have to do to provide for that is to strike out these words.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. As I understand it, it leaves it just the same except that the board of examiners for the colored school works for nothing and for the white schools this man gets \$4,000 a year.

Mr. MADDEN. There ought not to be any discrimination here.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. In this bill that is discrimination.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there is any discrimination.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I am taking the word of the chairman of the committee. He said that there was no salary for the other.

Mr. MADDEN. That can not be true.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I will leave that as between the gentleman from Illinois and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. There is provision made for a board of examiners for the white schools and another for the colored schools. The autonomy of the white schools and the autonomy of the colored schools are continued intact. There is no additional salary except the salary of the chief examiner. There is no compensation added on account of these people being examiners.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The paragraph at the top of page 7 creates a new position of chief examiner who shall serve as secretary to the board of examiners and as an aid to the superintendent in conducting these examinations. I might say that in Washington two-thirds of the teachers are white and one-third are colored. There is a much larger turnover among the white teachers than among the colored teachers. The colored teachers seem to be very proud of their positions and to hold on to them.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Under the language that the committee proposes, may I ask whether or not the duties of the chief examiner, which is the new position created, would be limited to a supervision of examinations of the white teachers, or would he have general supervision over both?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I understand that he would; yes. Under the provisions of the bill the superintendent of the schools is a member of both the white and the colored teachers' examining boards. This chief examiner is to act in a secretarial capacity, and I assume that in serving the superintendent, who is a member of both boards, he would serve both boards.

Mr. KETCHAM. If he does not, then the point made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] is well taken. There ought not to be any discrimination as would seem to be indicated here when a salary of \$4,500 is paid one and no additional salary is paid to the other. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.



The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 11, strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$5,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is just a question of whether you are going to pay these assistant superintendents \$5,000 instead of \$4,500.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What do they get now?

Mr. BLANTON. As I understand it, the assistant superintendent gets \$2,800 a year.

Mr. GASQUE. They get \$3,600.

Mr. BLANTON. The principal of the big Central High School gets a basic salary of \$3,500 with an increase of \$100 for five years, and he is the highest paid man there.

Mr. GASQUE. My information is from one of the members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. If it is wrong—

Mr. BLANTON. What do these assistant superintendents get now?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will have that information in a moment.

Mr. RAKER. While the gentleman is examining, how many are there of these assistant superintendents?

Mr. BLANTON. I think there are only three of these first assistants.

Mr. RAKER. That is indefinite, coming from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, I am on this salary part of it. I am waiting for the committee to give me some information.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to give the gentleman some information right there with regard to assistant superintendents. At Dallas it is \$6,000 a year, and they have got two of them. The people out there decide on how much they will pay their men, and Dallas is about one-third the size of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. By referring to my minority report, I find that they get \$3,750; that is the assistant's salary. I find it in my minority report, and I do not now have to depend upon the committee. The gentleman from Minnesota first sought to give \$750 raise. In his bill as originally introduced he provided them pay of \$4,500. It is therefore a \$750 raise already, but he was not satisfied with that, and when the committee met they passed an amendment giving them not \$750 but \$1,250. This committee amendment, if you vote for it, will give these three assistant superintendents a \$1,250 raise, or a salary of \$6,000 per year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. How much on an average do they raise the teachers' salaries, the people who do the work here in these schools?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the average raise is \$600 or \$700.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Not so much a raise as the assistant superintendent?

Mr. BLANTON. No; for this is a \$1,250 raise. It ought to be sufficient to give these superintendents the \$750 raise, but now they want to give them a \$1,250 raise instead of a \$750 raise, and I feel like I can not go with them. That is a matter for all of us to decide. We ought not to vote for this amendment, because even by voting it down it gives these assistant superintendents a \$750 raise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no last word, only "\$5,000."

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The last word is "reached."

The CHAIRMAN. In the committee amendment it is to substitute "\$5,000" for "\$4,500."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I listened to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said a moment ago. It was forcefully uttered, but did not impress me as being argumentative. He said that we had not raised anybody else's salary as it is now proposed to raise the salaries of these assistant school superintendents. Well, there is no other class of Government employees in Washington who have as great and vitally important a duty to perform as have the school-teachers in the District of Columbia. [Applause.] Not one. I have made that statement before on this floor, coupled with the statement that there are two supremely important professions in this Republic, one the profession of the school-teacher and the other that of the honest, able, high-minded, public-spirited, fearless editor.

Mr. KING. That species is extinct.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In support of my estimate of the business of the school-teacher, I will quote what a great American long ago said about it:

The dignity of the vocation of a teacher is beginning to be understood; the idea is dawning upon us that no office can compare in solemnity and importance with that of training the child; that skill to form the young to energy, truth, and virtue is worth more than the knowledge of all other arts and sciences; and that the encouragement of excellent teachers is the first duty which a community owes to itself. I say the truth is dawning and must make its way. \* \* \* The whole worth of a school lies in the teacher. You may accumulate the most expensive apparatus for instruction, but without an intellectual, gifted teacher it is little better than rubbish; and such a teacher without apparatus may effect the happiest results. \* \* \*

What we want is a race of teachers acquainted with the philosophy of the mind, gifted men and women, who shall respect human nature in the child and strive to touch and gently bring out its best powers and sympathies, and who shall devote themselves to this as the great end of life. This good, I trust, is to come, but it comes slowly. \* \* \* This good requires that education shall be recognized by the community as its highest interest and duty.

It requires that the instructors of youth shall take precedence of the money-getting class, and that the woman of fashion shall fall behind the female teacher.

That was the noble and true conception of the vocation of a school-teacher held by one of the noblest, wisest men this Republic has ever known, William Ellery Channing. A teacher takes a little boy or a little girl at the habit-forming age; and, as was said generations ago, habit is a cable; we weave a strand a day and at last it becomes so strong that we can not break it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by what the gentleman from Wisconsin said; but, as he says of the speech of the gentleman from Texas, it has no relation whatever to the paragraph we are considering.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The whole section is under consideration, and this is an amendment to one paragraph of it, and I could not see a better opportunity to bring home this great truth, and I had it right there.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And the gentleman did it very well, indeed. I am not concerned very much as to the salary the first assistant superintendent shall receive. Five thousand dollars may be right. It may not be too large a salary for him if he is competent to hold the position; but I have been attracted by a long, long list of officers, each with an imposing title, and each with a considerably larger salary than is paid to teachers who do the real work. I am also concerned with the fact that the increase of pay provided for each man or woman who holds an imposing title is larger than the increase provided for teachers.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In a moment. The bill tells of superintendents, assistant superintendents—I do not know how many; first assistant superintendents, principals—I do not know how many; assistant principals, teaching principals, supervising principals, directors, general secretaries, community secretaries, chief attendance officers; officers and titles too numerous to mention, justifying the statements that have come to me—reliable, I believe—that our schools have system, system; more system and more intricate machinery than anything else. They are becoming top-heavy; they are breaking down. More attention is paid to those who hold high official positions and are drawing high salaries than is paid to teachers in the grades, the teachers whose work is more difficult and of even greater importance than are the duties performed or assumed by many of those who carry high-sounding titles.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman is not quite right in that statement. The last time these teachers' schedules were fixed by law was in 1906. There have been some increased allowances recommended by committees. In the increases in the schedules the gentleman will find—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman is not asking a question; I yielded only for a question.

Mr. SNELL. The assistant superintendent is one of the smallest increases in the whole list.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How many are there? Who appoints them? Are they made and created in the dis-

cretion of the superintendent, or by whom? I have had no answer to that inquiry, yet I have made it of gentlemen who, I thought, had information on the subject.

I fully agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and with the statement he read, that there is no more important or honorable profession than that of teaching. I agree also that teachers never have been and are not now properly paid. I think perhaps we are giving proper attention to the salaries of those higher up, but I am convinced that we are careless and neglectful as to salaries of teachers of the grades. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The time for debate on this amendment has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to this, that teachers of kindergarten and elementary schools are 845 in number. The gentleman referred to principals. We have principals in the 15 rooms, 59, so that he can see the comparison that he is trying to bring out, that we have more teachers at high salaries than we ought to have, is not sustained. There is one superintendent, and we have two assistant superintendents and one for the colored schools, so that he can see there that we certainly must have superintendents to take care of the work that belongs to superintendents of such a large class of children as we have here, about 70,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 60, noes 34. So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 12, strike out "\$100" and insert "\$200."

Mr. SEARS of Florida rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak against the amendment. I do not want that right to be taken away from me.

The CHAIRMAN. The first speech should be one in favor of the committee amendment. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, you put me in an embarrassing position, but I will do the best I can. I am opposed to the amendment. I hope this amendment will not carry.

I listened with interest to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] said, and I am in hearty accord with every word he said.

For 10 years I worked with and tried to assist young men and young lady school teachers, and I want to say that then and now I bemoaned the fact that they were not paid the salary to which I felt they were entitled. I had hoped that when I came to Congress times might change and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] said, that the ones who did the real work might get the real pay. But I find that again the hopes of the school teachers are partly blasted, and I fear that they will go on to the end of time getting about the same salary they have always gotten. Of course we men higher up, those with the high-sounding titles, can get \$7,500 or \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year. I believe the \$20,000 maximum was mentioned by my friend from New York [Mr. SNELL]. But when you come to teachers, as stated by my other colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], you can not succeed in making much of a raise.

Now, if I have read the report correctly—and I am reading from the report—the kindergarten teachers received last year the wonderful salary of \$1,200 a year. The House should do justice to these good women who are molding the lives and character of the children of this city. But instead we are going to give them the wonderful increase of \$200, making their compensation \$1,400, in order that they may live in luxury.

We are all appealing for the votes of the teachers if we demand for them what we believe they are entitled to; but turn-

ing to some official who works perhaps one month out of a year, we propose to pay him \$4,000 a year and call that statesmanship. We should expect consistency. I hope sometimes, Mr. Chairman, that Members of Congress and the people back home will eventually appreciate the great work the teachers are doing and give to the teachers the salaries they are entitled to, and not give the good salaries merely to the higher class men because they happen to have some exalted title.

This is no new question with me. Back home I made the fight for increase of wages for the school-teachers. Then I was working for \$125 a month as superintendent and refused a raise because the teachers' salaries could not be raised. The members of the school board were working for \$4 a month and their mileage. I thought they might raise the small salaries they were paying the teachers, and we did raise the teachers' salaries, but we did not raise the amount paid the members of the school board. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] said, the reason we did not was because the people voted for the members of the school board and the superintendent, and they did not dare cut the teachers' salaries and raise their own salaries. But when we come up here, after making our pledges and our promises, then we forget, perhaps, what we told the people back home.

Why, Mr. Chairman, you can go into the Department of Justice, you can go into the Veterans' Bureau, and you can go into any bureau in Washington and you will find that the young men and young women who are doing the real work—the chiefs of the bureaus, clerks, and so forth—are getting practically nothing. I am against that system, and I believe the time has come when the little man, the real man, should get some justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen, I want to appeal to you on this amendment. This paragraph involves three men only—two white assistant superintendents and one colored—three men. They are now getting \$3,750 a year each. You have just passed one amendment to increase their salary \$1,250, or, in other words, to pay them \$5,000. Is not that enough? Now you are called upon to pass another amendment which would give them another \$1,000 raise, or, in other words, raise them \$2,250, to \$6,000 per year. Are you going to do that? Because they have already served their longevity term; they have already served their five years; and the very moment you pass this second amendment you will add another \$1,000 to the salary of these men, and instead of getting \$3,750, as they are now getting, if you pass this second amendment they will get \$6,000 a year. That is more of an increase than I am willing to give them.

Now, if you gentlemen want to pay them that additional \$2,250, you can do it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that we propose to offer at the end of this section an amendment which will provide that all supervisory officials and administrative officials shall receive for the next year only their basic salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, they are now getting \$3,750, and you are fixing in five years' time to pay them \$6,000. You have already given them a \$1,250 raise. Is not \$5,000 enough? Why do you want to add this extra \$1,000, especially when you have a letter from the commissioners stating that the Bureau of the Budget has turned this bill down?

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. Let me say to the gentleman that the Bureau of the Budget included this very increase in the bill which they indorsed.

Mr. BLANTON. But it did not include all the increases. I agree with my friend from Minnesota that increases ought to be given to these good teachers, but when you provide increases for them you do not provide as much as \$2,250 each per year.

Mr. KELLER. Is not the gentleman in favor of the Reed bill, which was indorsed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I am in favor of giving increases to the teachers, but not \$2,250 increases to these officers. Of course, the officers went to the Bureau of the Budget and had theirs fixed first.

Mr. KELLER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, they did; and then you had to put the extra raises for the teachers in the bill afterwards.

Mr. KELLER. The school board and the superintendent of schools—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want the gentleman to take all of my five minutes' time. If you gentlemen want to vote for an



increase of \$2,250 all right, and, of course, I can not keep you from doing it. But that is a matter between you and your conscience and your constituencies. If you do favor such a large increase and you can go home and face your people and square yourselves, I shall not complain of such action.

The other day a petition was presented to the House from 350,000 farmers against salary raises, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW], a member of the Republican steering committee, put it in the RECORD, and you are paying no attention to it.

Mr. GILBERT. I would like to make this suggestion as to why this amendment should not pass, and that is because after providing a salary of \$5,000, if you raise that salary \$200 a year for five years it will make \$1,000 more, or \$6,000, and as there seems to be considerable sentiment for reducing the salary of the superintendent to \$6,000, you would then have the first assistant at the end of five years receiving as much as the superintendent.

Mr. BLANTON. That is true, of course.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman about the petition which 350,000 farmers sent in, asking that there should be no salary increases. Does not the gentleman think that those who favor increasing salaries will see to it that it gets no further than being buried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BLANTON. It looks like it. I have watched raise after raise, and Members are paying no attention to it, and I appeal to you in this instance to pay some attention to the petition of the farmers, because they are the backbone of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 65, noes 34.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 13, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$6,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not bear very heavily on the amendment. I am not going to criticize anyone. That is not my business or intention, but I wonder why we are all the time telling what the folks are going to do at home and what the folks at home would think of us, and whether we are going to do differently here from what we do in an ordinary business transaction.

It has been admitted and conceded that all of the teachers' salaries have been raised, under this bill, practically to their satisfaction. The entire committee has agreed upon the general salary raise of the great body of teachers. Then come the principals, the superintendents, and the assistant superintendents. Why should we not use the same ordinary horse sense, if I may use that appropriate expression, in legislating in regard to these matters that we do in every other business transaction? You know and I know that when you employ a superintendent or an assistant superintendent for any business on earth you select a man who has had experience, you select a man who has brains, you select a man who has nerve, you select a man who has courage, you select a man who has honesty, and the same thing would apply to the older teachers, so that you have picked out one who will make the entire enterprise a success, and that is how success comes—by having some one to engineer and control and keep the entire system working up to the very limit. In every private enterprise, in every bit of work you do, you provide men and women of that character and you pay them according to the responsibility cast upon them. You know and I know, while we are giving every credit to the school teacher in every grade of his or her work, that the superintendent, if he is doing his job properly, or the assistant superintendent, not only on holidays, not only after school, but every day and all the time is looking out so that when school opens and the whole system starts, it will keep working and functioning legitimately and up to the best standards, and we should pay these men and women for their work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 7, line 7, strike out lines 16, 17, and 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The superintendent of schools shall receive a salary of \$7,500 per annum."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Texas the purpose of the reference to line 7.

Mr. BLANTON. It refers to lines 16, 17, and 18, on page 7. I ask to change that by striking out "line 7."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be corrected in accordance with the gentleman's suggestion.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, the superintendent of schools will receive \$7,500 a year, the same as a Congressman, the same as a United States Senator, and more than all the bureau chiefs of the government now receive, including the expert scientists in our various bureaus. If you do not pass this amendment the superintendent will receive \$10,000 a year. It is just a question of whether you want to pay him \$7,500 or \$10,000. I want to pay him \$7,500. I am willing to admit that he may be just as valuable to the government as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and no more. I am willing to admit that he may be as valuable to the country as the majority leader—and he is valuable—but no more. I am not willing to admit that he is more valuable than all of the 96 United States Senators at the other end of the Capitol. He may be more valuable than some, but I am not willing to admit that he is more valuable than all of them. He may be more valuable than some of the Members of the House. He may be more valuable than the gentleman from Texas, but I am not willing to admit that he is more valuable to the country than every one of my colleagues here individually.

The law fixes his salary now at \$5,000. We have been paying him \$6,000. I am proposing now to raise it \$2,500 by law and give him \$1,500 more than he has ever received and make it \$7,500 per year. He goes out and lectures in some of the universities of the land. I am informed he gets paid for this. I do not object to that. He ought to get paid for it. I think the man is capable of delivering a lecture that is worth money, and when he gives such a lecture out in the country he ought to be paid for it. I do not object to that at all, but as superintendent of schools of Washington, I think \$7,500 is enough. Now, it is simply a question of what my colleagues want to do. I know I am going to vote not to give him any more than that amount. I will not fall out with you if you vote differently, because you have a right to vote as you please, but I do hope that you will not raise this salary higher than \$7,500. It is just a continual drain on the people's Treasury, and we ought to stop it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN, Mr. MacLAFFERTY, and Mr. MADDEN rose. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN], the chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have read in my time an amendment offered by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STALKER].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STALKER] will be read for the information of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. STALKER: Page 7, line 18, after the word "reached," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following: "Provided, That all officers included in Article II of this act shall start at the basic salary without credit for service prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Texas will not be adopted. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STALKER] is adopted, we will only pay our superintendent during the next year \$8,000, with an increase up to \$10,000 in the course of two years.

I want to read for the information of the committee the salaries paid in other cities that are comparable with Washington. New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Ohio, Detroit, Mich., pay \$12,000 a year. Oakland, Calif., pays \$11,000 a year. Jersey City, N. J., Boston, Buffalo, N. Y., Newark, N. J., Cincinnati, Omaha, Nebr., Youngstown, Ohio, St. Louis, Mo., Denver, Colo., pay \$10,000. Toledo, Ohio, pays \$9,750. Milwaukee, Wis., Akron, Ohio, Baltimore, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Minneapolis, Rochester, N. Y., Kansas City, Mo., Dayton, Ohio, pay \$8,000. Seattle, Wash., Columbus, Ohio, Birmingham, Ala., Des Moines, Iowa, Portland, Oreg., Richmond, Va., pay \$7,500. Dallas, Tex., pays \$7,200. We feel that by modifying the bill in the manner prescribed in the amendment which is pending before the committee, and providing that the basic salary for the next year shall be

\$8,000, we are setting a fair rate of pay for the superintendent of the great school system in this city. Washington is entitled to the very best talent in the educational branch of government that you can possibly obtain. We can not get the highest type of men for a salary less than we are providing in this bill.

I am not going into the merits or demerits or qualifications of the present superintendent of schools, but I do contend that the people are entitled to the very best talent you can get, and for the very best we have got to pay a fair salary. The committee feels by this limitation that we are not paying any more than the position calls for, or more than the superintendent of schools is entitled to. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be voted down. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman ought not to do that; this section embraces all the salaries in the entire bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the First Assistant Postmaster General of the United States, with 100,000 people under his jurisdiction, to-day gets only \$5,000 a year. When the classification act goes into effect he will get \$7,500 a year. That is true of many men in the Government employ with equally important responsibilities. Seven thousand five hundred dollars will be the maximum paid to any man at the head of any bureau in the Government of the United States under the classification law. There is no reason to assume that the board of education, the superintendent of schools, is more than a bureau in the Government. Surely not, and if we are going to set aside the law that we have only so recently passed by making exceptions to it every time some man's salary is at stake, we may as well set the law aside now for good and all. The time has come when there ought to be some consideration given to the problems that affect the Treasury. You must remember that these problems not only affect the Treasury but the pocketbook of every man, woman, and child in America. [Applause.] You can not make appropriations without levying taxes. We have just gone through the motion here of reducing taxes, and you keep on with this extravagant waste of the public funds and you will commence to increase the taxes before very long, and then what will your friends at home say? For after all, they are the ones you must account to.

I have no criticism of the ability of the gentleman who occupies the exalted position of superintendent of schools, but I do not believe in good conscience we can afford to pay for this place more than \$7,500 a year. We are charged with great responsibilities here and we must go to the people for election, we must, whether we will or not, pay more or less of what we get for campaign expenses, and yet we have no dearth of men who are willing to make the sacrifice. You come here from every section of the country, willing to give every pound of ability you possess in the interest of the Nation, and you are willing to do it because you want to be of service to your country. Now, let somebody be of service in other branches of the Government and let them make some sacrifice if sacrifice it be. I apprehend that no one will refuse to accept the superintendency of the schools of the District of Columbia at a salary of \$7,500 a year. The gentleman who occupies the position is now getting \$6,000, and he is only authorized by law to get \$5,000. We are proposing to give him \$7,500.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not true that there are men who would take the position for \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; that goes without saying, but we can get the best minds that can be had for \$7,500, and if the gentleman who occupies the exalted place refuses to take the job there will be 100 men to-morrow for the place. So let us vote down the committee proposal and place this salary, without further increase in the future, at \$7,500 a year.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the argument thus far advanced on this proposition—for and against the proposed amendment—has been by comparison of salaries. In my judgment the matter of this amendment and the bill itself should be settled upon its merits, rather than by a comparison of salaries. I want the superintendent of the schools of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, to be, if possible, just a little bit better than the superintendent of any of the public schools in any city of the United States. [Applause.] As one Member of this House I feel that we can not expect the best quality of service in our schools by underpayment either of the superintendent or of the teachers of the public schools of the Nation's Capital. The way to make our schools better is not only to pay our teachers better salaries, but to pay the officers and officials of our public schools, such as principals and

superintendents, better salaries, and thereby offer an inducement for both them and our teachers to reach a higher state of qualification in education. Oh, yes; it is argued that a Member of Congress gets a salary of only \$7,500 a year, and that is advanced as a reason why we should not pay the superintendent of the public schools of the Nation's Capital more than \$7,500. I venture the assertion that a vast majority of the educators and teachers of this country belong to what we commonly term the poorer classes of people. Very few of them, indeed, have ever accumulated any great amount of wealth in the profession of teaching, I am sure. For that reason, if for no other, it is my judgment that we should place teachers of this country above financial worries. Where is the Member of Congress without independent means who would stand before me this afternoon and say it is not a constant problem in arithmetic to make the buckle and the thong meet in Washington on a Congressman's salary? Let us have it that the Nation's Capital points the way in education to the States of this Nation, and the only way we can do that is by paying adequate salaries, not only to the teachers but to the principals, the assistant principals, superintendent, and assistant superintendents. I earnestly hope that any amendment to reduce the salaries carried in this bill will be defeated.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROACH. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Do not the people who are paying the taxes find it a serious problem in arithmetic to make both ends meet?

Mr. ROACH. Yes; they do. I represent an agricultural district in the State of Missouri, but I venture the assertion that if there were any of the farmers there who signed the petition referred to by the gentleman from Texas, those farmers are progressive enough in their ideas to want to pay their teachers and the educators of our country, who have the youth and the future foundation of this Government at stake, an adequate compensation for that service, so as to attract them to the profession of teaching and keep them there. It is false economy to do otherwise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired and without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield for me to submit a unanimous consent request?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. That will close all debate on all of these salaries.

Mr. WATKINS. I would like to have the gentleman increase that three minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. I desire to offer an amendment to increase the salary to \$10,000.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman mean the section or the paragraph?

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. The section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer a substitute to that. I move as a substitute that all debate upon the paragraph close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt as to whether that is a substitute.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. I am willing to accept that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UPSHAW. But, Mr. Chairman, I have already been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to protect the gentleman from Georgia. He has been recognized, and he yielded.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I make it to close in five minutes.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. I accept that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it has been the tragedy of America's educational life that the teaching pro-



profession has so long been made a stepping-stone to some position of higher financial value. Too long have we seen men and women accept teaching only until they could better their condition financially. It is a tremendous mistake, I think, to draw analogies, as has been done here this afternoon, between the salaries of governors and of superintendents and teachers. Most men who are elected to the office of governor, Representative, or Senator are men who have won prominence already either as lawyers or as business men, and, as has been brought out in this debate, most of them are well fixed financially with independent incomes, and therefore they can afford to work for the small salaries.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Pardon me, but I do not think I have the time.

Mr. KING. Is the gentleman quite correct in that last statement?

Mr. UPSHAW. Not always, but quite often. I think it is a tragedy to read that any State of this Union pays only three to four thousand dollars to a capable man as governor. I want to correct one statement of the gentleman from Texas, concerning my own State.

My own State of Georgia does not pay \$5,000, but now pays \$7,500 a year; and that golden-hearted man who is now Governor of Georgia, though a man of means, is worth every dollar, in his splendid devotion to duty. But that is not the thing. I am not responsible for what Chicago has done, nor what Milwaukee has done, nor Cincinnati, nor any other city. I did not vote the salaries of those men; but I am responsible for what this Congress will do in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UPSHAW. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Georgia has raised her governor's salary from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and I am proposing to raise this school superintendent's salary in the same amount, from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and the gentleman wants to make it \$10,000.

Mr. UPSHAW. I am looking beyond the superintendent of schools in Washington. I have spoken to something like 4,000,000 boys and girls of America since I got out of bed, where I stayed for seven years, trying to put fire in their hearts and iron in the blood of these boys and girls of our country who are the to-morrow of this Republic. I want to look to the future of the superintendent of schools in Washington, the superintendent of schools in my home city, in the other cities, and inspire other cities to follow the leadership of the Nation's Capital and raise the salary of those educators who must be statesmen as well as educators. It is a tragedy that any assistant superintendent or teacher in a school, man or woman, should have to make the teaching profession a stepping-stone until a real job is offered in things political or commercial or perhaps an opportunity to get married that may come to the ladies who are teaching. Bless their hearts, I want them all to marry. I want them to do so while there is opportunity, but I do not want them to be forced to get married and undertake to support a sorry sort of husband, because their salary would not take care of them as teachers. I want to see the Nation's Capital stand as an inspiration to all the other cities of America, and I want to see it so that in giving this inspiration we have had far vision and a great heart for the twin builders of our civilization, for the teachers along with the preachers have long been too much underpaid. I would like to crown them from now until the judgment day. [Applause.]

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion over the motion of the gentleman from Texas, which was a motion to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ZIHLMAN: On page 7, line 18, after the word "reached," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following: "Provided, That all officers included in article 2 of this act shall start at the basic salary, without credit for services prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. BLANTON. That is not a perfecting motion nor a substitute.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It is a perfecting amendment. The motion of the gentleman was to strike out.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no—

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Texas was to strike out the paragraph and insert certain words in lieu thereof. The motion of the gentleman from Maryland is to amend the text, and therefore perfects the text, and in the opinion of the Chair is preferential.

Mr. ASWELL. Can I offer a substitute for all of that?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. DYER. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ASWELL as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN]: Page 7, line 18, after the word "of," strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000."

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair that is a separate amendment and can not be offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted.

Mr. KETCHAM. I understand debate is exhausted, but I am simply asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am referring to the proposition advanced by the chairman of the committee, and I desire to call the attention of the Chair to page 10, line 9—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state we have not reached that.

Mr. KETCHAM. To the three lines which have a direct bearing upon the proposition we are now to vote upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state he does not see how it has any bearing, as it has not been read.

Mr. KETCHAM. I want to direct the attention of the Chair to this fact. This identical thought is incorporated in the suggestion offered by the chairman of the committee. I want to ask whether or not it is proper to strike out that when the same matter is offered further along in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be for the committee to decide.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STENGLE. If the Chair submits the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland first, and that offered by the gentleman from Texas last, how can a Member support each?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chairman presumes that gentlemen will have to use their best judgment in the matter of supporting an amendment on this proposition.

Mr. STENGLE. If the first of these amendments is adopted, will the second amendment then be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if the amendment that the gentleman from Maryland proposed is adopted there will then be a vote on any other amendment seeking to amend the text.

Mr. STENGLE. That is what I wanted to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, to strike out the figures "\$7,500" and insert "\$8,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER to the amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: In the last line of the amendment strike out the figures "\$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,000."

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the last amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It occurs to the Chair that that is an amendment to the third degree and is no substitute. It merely changes the figure.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. Will I have the right to offer that amendment if this amendment is voted down?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would think not, because the motion of the gentleman from Texas is—

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana is a preferential amendment to perfect the text if he wishes to offer it. While I am not in favor of it, by any sort of means, he can perfect the text by striking out \$8,000 before it is stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut mean the text in the original bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I was telling the gentleman from Louisiana that he had the right to offer it as a preferential amendment to perfect the text.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I so offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana did not offer it so a moment ago, but he does so now.

Mr. ASWELL. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana as a preferential amendment to perfect the text of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASWELL: Page 7, in line 18, after the word "of," strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert "\$12,000."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I make the point of order that there are no figures of "\$10,000" in the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. I would like very much to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes to explain this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ASWELL. I make that request.

Mr. MADDEN. I must object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The debate is exhausted. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], which is a perfecting amendment to perfect the text. The Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ASWELL: Page 7, line 18, after the word "of," strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert the figures "\$12,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. How can that be a perfecting amendment? The amendment starts off at \$8,000 and raises it a thousand dollars in two years, which would not put it at the figure mentioned, which is \$10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 74, yeas 61.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. ZIHLMAN and Mr. BLANTON to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 94, yeas 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. What becomes of the limitations?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the limitations contained in the amendment of the gentleman do not appear in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes, they do. That comes at the end of it.

Mr. SNELL. The language was perfected, so that it goes out of the bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to offer that amendment, which was adopted in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment consisting of a new section. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STALKER: Page 7, after line 18, insert as a new paragraph as follows:

"The school officers, provided for in Article II of this act, shall receive compensation at the basic salary fixed herein, and shall not receive credit for services prior to this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, all debate is closed only on the last paragraph. The section is still open to amendment, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The section is still open to amendment, except the last paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I wish to offer an amendment. On page 2, line 6, strike out "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150," and in line 7, strike out "\$2,200" and in lieu thereof insert "\$2,600."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: On page 2, line 6, strike out the figures "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$150," and in line 7, strike out the figures "\$2,200" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,600."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will carry an increase of salary or service pay after this year for the teachers of Group A, the lower grade, and the teachers concerning whom so much eloquence has been—

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on this section is now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recall that debate was closed on the section.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan (continuing). The class of teachers in whose behalf Members have indulged in so much eloquence to-day, saying, and very properly, I believe, that the salaries of the teachers in the lower grades are not high enough; that they have received too little attention from those who prepared the bill, whereas those receiving the higher salaries have been nicely taken care of. Here is an opportunity to do something for a class of teachers who deserve and need help.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. On what page is the amendment offered?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 2.

Mr. SNELL. How did we get back to page 2?

The CHAIRMAN. Because it is all a part of the section.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield while I submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to what our friend is proposing to do. The commissioners, the Board of Education, and the Bureau of the Budget approved a certain salary bill. It was a joint agreement between the three, between the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District, and the Bureau of the Budget. That bill came here introduced by the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. REED], and was known as the Reed bill. But those of us who wanted to do a little more for the teachers approved of the Keller bill as a substitute for the Reed bill, and we gave these particular teachers a raise of \$200 more than had been agreed upon by the Board of Education, the commissioners, and the Bureau of the Budget, and that provision was put in the Keller bill. Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] wants to give them another raise of \$200.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Evidently the gentleman thinks this has all been fixed up and he names the different bodies which passed upon it, but I want to say that the more concerned and the higher up they are the worse it is.



Mr. BLANTON. I know the gentleman does not pay any attention to the Bureau of the Budget; it represents his President, though, and it represents the financial program of his President. The commissioners agreed with them, the Board of Education agreed with them, and yet after all that we came in and gave them \$200 more in the committee, \$200 more than had been agreed on. After we did that the Keller bill was sent to the commissioners for their approval; they submitted it to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget sent it back and said it was too much; that it was against the President's financial program and he disapproved of it, but we put it in just the same. We gave them \$200 more than they had agreed to just the same, and now the gentleman from Michigan wants to give them \$200 more.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon. My amendment does not increase it at all; it only increases the amount to be added year by year as it goes along.

Mr. BLANTON. But the difficulty is they have already earned their longevity service; that is what they will get on July 1 under this bill, and that is the trouble.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Not under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BLANTON. But that amendment does not apply to the teachers; only to the officers.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It applies to all in this section.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it applies only to the officers; it does not apply to the teachers at all. All the teachers get their longevity allowance under this bill according to the years of service they have rendered, either in this school or in any other school, and they get it even if they have been in the service during the war. If they are men and served in France for three years, they are allowed three years of extra longevity under this bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield if the gentleman will not take up all of my time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is it not true—

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not yield any further.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan (continuing). That if Congress votes in accordance with the sentiments so often expressed here and makes this little increase, that the matter can be very well taken care of by an amendment, just as the other matter was taken care of by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not in favor of cheating the teachers out of their longevity allowance. I am in a different position than is the gentleman because I am in favor of their longevity allowance. But the trouble is that the committee has studied this bill and given careful consideration to it, and the gentleman does not know a thing in the world about it and is coming in here and offering an amendment on the floor that is going to do something, and the gentleman does not know exactly what it is going to do.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield? Was it not demonstrated just now that the committee did not know very much about the bill when the gentleman asked them a question and did not get any information?

Mr. BLANTON. They know a whole lot about it, but it is a little hard for them to tell it. The committee knows all about the bill and has studied it carefully.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Is it not a fact that this bill is 100 per cent satisfactory to the teachers in the various grades?

Mr. BLANTON. This bill suits the teachers exactly, and I hope the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw his amendment, because it does suit them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not know very much about it, but I know the gentleman is not speaking the sentiments of the teachers of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. I know the committee is speaking their sentiments. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. KELLER] has studied the matter and has worked for the teachers of the District, and so has the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN], and I do not think that is a fair aspersion upon them. They have worked for the teachers, and this bill pleases the teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan) there were—ayes 29, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARTICLE IV.—METHOD OF ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES TO SALARIES.

SEC. 4. That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, every teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board of Education on permanent tenure on June 30, 1924, shall receive the salary provided in the foregoing schedule for his class or position in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Teachers who are assigned to Group C of class 2 or Group A of class 3 and who on June 30, 1924, are receiving either the basic salary or the maximum salary of Group A of class 6 under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, shall receive a salary in Group C of class 2 or Group A of class 3 which is next above their present compensations, and in addition shall receive one annual increase in salary of \$100 as provided in the foregoing schedule.

(b) Teachers who are assigned to Group C of class 2, or Group A of class 3, and who on June 30, 1924, are receiving salaries in Group A of class 6 under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, which are between the basic salaries and the maximum salaries of said Group A of class 6, shall receive a salary in Group C of class 2 or Group A of class 3 which is next above their present compensations and in addition shall receive two annual increases of salary of \$100 each as provided in the foregoing schedule.

(c) All other teachers and school librarians assigned to Group A of the salary classes in the foregoing schedule shall receive the salary in the classes to which assigned which is next above their present compensations and in addition shall receive one annual increase of salary of \$100 as provided in the foregoing schedule.

(d) All other teachers, school officers, and employees shall receive the salaries provided in the foregoing schedule for their respective classes or positions which are next above their present compensations: *Provided*, That under the provisions of this section the present compensation of any teacher, school officer, or other employee shall be construed to include basic salary, longevity allowance, session-room allowance, and increase of compensation (bonus): *Provided further*, That teachers and other employees assigned to classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the foregoing schedule shall be entitled to longevity placement as provided in section 6: *Provided further*, That the salaries assigned to teachers, school officers, and other employees in accordance with this section shall be in lieu of the compensation to which said teachers, school officers, and other employees may be entitled during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, as provided by the act of June 20, 1906, as amended: *And provided further*, That no teacher, school officer, or other employee shall in any event receive less during the year ending June 30, 1925, than his total compensation as of June 30, 1924.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to get a little information, Mr. Chairman. I had intended offering an amendment, but the Clerk was reading so fast I could not understand him, and we got by the paragraph. On page 7, line 21, the second paragraph reads as follows:

That the Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed, on recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to classify and assign all teachers."

Did the committee intend to make it mandatory on the Board of Education to classify the teachers, as recommended by the superintendent of schools, and follow no other course and make no personal investigation?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The committee wished to make it mandatory that all teachers should be assigned and classified as provided in this salary schedule; yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Under this section, if the Chairman will permit me, the school board can only classify as recommended by the superintendent of schools. I had intended to call your attention to that and offer an amendment cutting out "on recommendation of the superintendent of schools," and provide that this should be done under such rules and regulations as the Board of Education might provide. I call your attention to this matter for this particular purpose. From personal experience and observation, the superintendent of schools may get it in for a certain number of teachers or a certain class of teachers and the superintendent will recommend to the school board that they be demoted, or, if he likes them, that they be promoted, if he wants to play favorites. Under this section, as I read it—and some of my colleagues have agreed with me—the school board is helpless. If they should make a private investigation and should find out the facts were to the contrary, the board would still have to classify them as reported by the superintendent of schools, and I do not believe the committee intended any such arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would call attention to the fact that we have passed by the section which the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. That is true, and I called the Chairman's attention to that fact. I am sorry it took the Chair several minutes to discover it.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I said I was endeavoring to offer an amendment but the clerk passed it so rapidly I did not do so, and I was returning to the section in order to ask a question.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that the committee considered the matter of giving rather broad powers to the superintendent under this bill, and the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE], who is an experienced educator, stated he believed the best results would be obtained by lodging this power in the hands of the superintendent, and stated that where it was lodged in the Board of Education there was chaos and more discontent than if there was such broad power vested in the man who is responsible for the administration and the success of the school system.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I am sorry I disagree with my friends, and I think they will find out that the other plan would work better.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I would like to know what the legal definition of classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 is and where they are to be found in the law; and what the legal definition of Groups A, B, and C is and where they are to be found in the law, and what these classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 and Groups A, B, and C mean; how they are to be organized, who is to define them and what law there is in this bill or anywhere else to warrant any such designations.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state to the gentleman from California that I was not present at the hearings, but it is my understanding that all grades of teachers are fixed in the act of 1906, which provides that teachers who teach a certain length of time shall be promoted from one grade to another, and it is my understanding that it is the school act of 1906 which is the basic law which this follows.

Mr. CURRY. There is no such thing as Groups A, B, and C nor classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the basic law.

Mr. KELLER. The groups are created in the new bill.

Mr. CURRY. What does it mean?

Mr. KELLER. It corresponds with the old grades.

Mr. CURRY. You permit the superintendent of schools of Washington, who is a pretty good politician and lobbyist but not an educator, under this bill to reward his friends and punish his enemies. Through his orders every Member of the House is card indexed in his office, and every school-teacher has been instructed to ascertain and report as to the prospective vote of every Member with whom he or she is acquainted, and will be held responsible for the accuracy of the report which has been card indexed in the office of the superintendent under the name of the Member and of the teacher. There is nothing in the bill that states that transfer and promotion shall be for length of service and successful teaching; it takes good care of the high-school teachers, the superintendent, and his assistants, but it does not of the common schools. Now, 80 per cent of all the children in the United States attend the common schools and do not enter the high schools. Only about 20 per cent enter high schools; about 5 per cent graduate from the high schools.

The committee ought to amend the bill and not leave the arbitrary power of promoting, demoting, and transferring teachers in the hands of the superintendent. The committee should define what Groups A, B, and C mean and what classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 mean. I believe in giving the teachers more salary than they have at the present time. I think we ought to do something for the schools in this city, but I do not think that we ought in this bill to make the superintendent of schools, who is not an educator, a czar and absolutely the controlling power over the teachers, without any appeal from his judgment, and give him an opportunity to exercise his likes and dislikes unchecked on the teachers.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 9 of the bill, where it refers to the Groups A, B, and C, and refers to the act of 1906.

Mr. CURRY. I know; but what does it mean?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in order to ask the gentleman a question on the point raised by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS]. Page 7, line 22, it says "the Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed, on recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to classify and assign all teachers," and so forth. That gives to the superintendent of schools the power to say how they shall be classified.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It gives him the power to recommend to the board of education.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Ought not the language to be "in consultation with the superintendent of schools," and not say "on his recommendation"? They are authorized to classify on his recommendation. They could not do a thing except on his recommendation. "In consultation" would carry out the intent if that is the intent of the committee.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that we intended to lodge this power in the hands of the superintendent of schools.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why, then, did you mention the Board of Education if you intended to give the superintendent of schools the power. This language turns over to this man the arbitrary power to do as he pleases.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. We assumed that he would work with the Board of Education.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Board of Education is a mere figurehead. They can indicate where the teacher shall go, but the superintendent will say where they shall go. That is the only interpretation that can be put on this language. It should read "in consultation with" him. This language lodges in one man, without any supervisory power, the authority to do as he pleases with all the teachers, and in my judgment that is absolutely wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk calls the Chair's attention to the fact that on page 7, line 26, the word "office" is misspelled, and in line 4, page 10, the word "foregoing" is spelled incorrectly. Without objection, the Clerk will make the corrections.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 7, line 22, for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out the words "on recommendation of" and insert in lieu thereof "in consultation with."

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to page 7, line 22, for the purpose of offering an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 22, after the word "directed," strike out the words "on recommendation of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in consultation with."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to this portion of the bill for the purpose of offering the amendment?

Mr. KELLER. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will let this go he will save a motion to recommit. The gentleman does not want to make a czar of this man. I shall make the motion to recommit and put this language in.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. That teachers, school officers, and other employees in the service of the Board of Education on July 1, 1924, shall be placed in the salary classes and positions of the foregoing schedule as follows:

(a) From kindergarten assistants, class 1; kindergarten principals, class 3; model teachers of kindergartens, class 4; teachers of first and second grades, class 2; teachers of third and fourth grades, class 3; teachers of fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, class 4; teachers of eighth grades, class 5; model teachers of first and second grades, class 4; teachers of manual training, drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, and domestic art in the graded schools, classes 3 and 4; assistants to the directors of primary instruction, classes 4 and 5; vocational trade instructors, class 5; and teachers of Americanization work, class 5, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 1, Group A, of the foregoing schedule.

(b) From head teachers and teachers of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, class 6, Group A; and teachers of manual training, drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, and domestic art in the normal, high, and manual-training high schools, class 6, Group A, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 3, Group A, of the foregoing schedule, except as herein otherwise provided.

(c) From teachers of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, promoted for superior work, class 6, Group B, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 3, Group B, of the foregoing schedule.

(d) From teachers in junior high schools, possessing the eligibility requirements of teachers of elementary schools, classes 3, 4, and 5, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 3, Group A, of the foregoing schedule.

(e) From teachers in junior high schools possessing the eligibility requirements of teachers of senior high schools, class 6, Group A, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 2, Group C, of the foregoing schedule.

(f) From librarians, class 5, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 4, Group A, of the foregoing schedule.



(g) From teaching principals with from four to seven rooms, classes 2, 3, 4, and 5, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 5 of the foregoing schedule.

(h) From teaching principals with from 8 to 15 rooms, classes 2, 3, 4, and 5, under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 6 of the foregoing schedule.

(i) From administrative principals with 16 or more rooms, class 5; principals of grade manual-training schools, class 6, Group A; and principal of Americanization work under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 7 of the foregoing schedule.

(j) From principals of junior high schools under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 8 of the foregoing schedule.

(k) From principals of senior high and normal schools under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 9 of the foregoing schedule.

(l) From directors of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and primary instruction; assistant directors of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and primary instruction; and assistant supervisor of manual training under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 10 of the foregoing schedule.

(m) From director of intermediate instruction and supervisor of manual training under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 10 of the foregoing schedule, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act.

(n) From director of penmanship and assistant director of penmanship under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 3, Group B, of the foregoing schedule, as provided in section 2 of this act.

(o) From heads of departments in high and manual-training high schools, class 6, Group B; assistant principals; and assistant principals (deans of girls) under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 11 of the foregoing schedule.

(p) From supervising principals under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 12 of the foregoing schedule.

(q) From teachers not otherwise provided for, classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 under the act of June 20, 1906, as amended, to class 1, Group A, class 2, Group A or Group C, or class 3, Group A, of the foregoing schedule in accordance with the eligibility qualifications possessed and the character of duties to be performed by such teachers: *Provided*, That all teachers, school officers, and other employees in the service of the Board of Education on July 1, 1924, not specifically mentioned in the provisions of this section shall be placed in the salary classes and positions in the foregoing schedule in accordance with the eligibility qualifications possessed and the character of duties to be performed by such teachers, school officers, and other employees: *Provided further*, That all teachers, school officers, or other employees hereafter appointed, shall be placed in the salary classes and positions in the foregoing schedule by the said board, and all teachers and other employees assigned to classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the foregoing schedule in the service of the said board on July 1, 1924, or to which they may thereafter be appointed: *Provided further*, That in crediting experience in teaching of any person who has been absent from his duties as a teacher because of military service the said board is hereby authorized to include naval, military, or other service with the armed forces of the United States Government or its allies as the equivalent of teaching experience: *And provided further*, That no teacher or other employee shall be placed in the salary schedule for more than the fourth year of experience in classes 1, 2, Group A, or 4, or more than the fifth year of experience in class 2, Group C, or class 3.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I take this opportunity to say a few words regarding the work done in the District of Columbia relative to the Americanization work and those in charge of it. I have had the opportunity of viewing the work and seeing the character of people in charge, as well as the result of the work being accomplished. There are classes of grown men and women who are being instructed in American history, American law, American institutions, and the work justifies the money expended and is a credit to the schools of the District of Columbia, especially to the principals and the teachers who are conducting the schools.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The pupils take to it very willingly?

Mr. RAKER. They not only take to it willingly but they show a keen interest in the work. It is a demonstration of what can be done and what ought to be done to make those who are not familiar with our language and institutions familiar with them and give them an opportunity to understand our form of Government.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. KING. The gentleman speaks of their study of American history. Does he know what history is being used in the school, whether it is Muzzy's?

Mr. RAKER. The history that is used in the schools is taught from the Constitution of the United States and the decisions of the Supreme Court, the laws of Congress, the laws and constitutions of the various States, so that when these men leave the schools they are familiar to some extent with our form of government. I think that we could not expend the money to better purpose than to give these people who come here, many of them of age before they land, an opportunity to understand our institutions, so that the 1,400 foreign-language newspapers now printed in America, including the 37 daily foreign-language papers printed in New York City alone, may be eliminated and so that these men who come here to live will make this country their country, willing to give their all for it.

They ought to be able to understand the English language and American institutions and have an opportunity to receive the benefits of the country. The alien that is coming to this country is not having the proper opportunity and sympathy that he ought to have. Let us give those who are here an opportunity to get acquainted with our institutions and form of government and prevent any more coming until those who are now here are assimilated. He is being imposed upon by those who understand a little English and who understand his language. The work that this school is doing and the work that is being conducted in the schools of this District and elsewhere in Americanization is something that ought to be encouraged and extended. Every man in America ought to understand the English language and to understand our form and character of government, so that he can intelligently vote at all elections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 2, after the figure "3," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That nothing in this or any other section of this bill will authorize service rendered prior to July 1, 1924, to be credited to any employees other than teachers, and all accredited service shall be confined to service rendered in and to the schools of the District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. There shall be two first assistant superintendents of schools, one white first assistant superintendent for the white schools who, under the direction of the superintendent of schools, shall have general supervision over the white schools; and one colored first assistant superintendent for the colored schools who, under the direction of the superintendent of schools, shall have sole charge of all employees, classes, and schools in which colored children are taught. The first assistant superintendents shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the superintendent of schools.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to call attention to one important matter. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is a very important one, and it should be agreed to. I am surprised that the gentleman from Minnesota refuses to accept it, and refuses to permit him to return to the section, because he is going to force a motion to recommit, and possibly a roll call, when by permitting us to put this in it would save all of that trouble. I want to read the paragraph as it would read after being amended, for the benefit of the gentleman from Minnesota. It is on page 7, section 2, and it would read as follows:

That the Board of Education is hereby authorized and empowered, in consultation with the superintendent of schools—

And so forth.

If the gentleman would permit that, it would authorize the Board of Education to do this, in consultation with the superintendent of schools.

If you do not accept the amendment, you make a czar out of the superintendent of schools. He can do just as he pleases without any consultation whatever with the Board of Education. In other words, he makes the Board of Education do just what he tells them to do without giving them any discretion whatever. You force the Board of Education to take the recommendation of the superintendent of schools without giving them any say so whatever in the matter. I do not think you

ought to do that. We are going to ask for a vote on that if we have to do it under a motion to recommit.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is it not a fact that this language is in the law of almost every city school board in the country?

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished authority on New York schools [Mr. LA GUARDIA] says it does not work out very well in New York. I do not care whether it is in other school laws or not. I do not think any man ought to be a czar. I think the Board of Education ought to pass upon the recommendation made by the superintendent. That is what the Board of Education is for. If you make his recommendation supreme, without giving the board the right to pass upon it, you fix it so that the Board of Education is absolutely helpless and the teachers are helpless. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph so as to offer this amendment.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Chair desires to call attention to the word "principals," in line 2, page 17.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make the correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to change so as to make the spelling accord with the text. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman if he was responsible for the former objection?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, no; I will say it was agreeable to me.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Was objection lodged by a member of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Then I object.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I ask that the amendment be put.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana—

Mr. STEVENSON. We have passed the paragraph.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the objection. Without objection, the correction will be made as requested by the gentleman from Maryland.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That boards of examiners for carrying out the provisions of the statutes with reference to examinations of teachers shall consist of the superintendent of schools and not less than four nor more than six members of the supervisory or teaching staff of the white schools for the white schools, and of the superintendent of schools and not less than four nor more than six members of the supervisory or teaching staff of the colored schools for the colored schools. The designations of members of the supervisory or teaching staff for membership on these boards shall be made annually by the Board of Education on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask, on page 18, line 21, that the words "on the recommendation of" be stricken out and the words "in consultation with" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATKINS: On page 18, line 21, strike out the words "on the recommendation of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in consultation with."

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas and nays.

On a division (demanded by Mr. WATKINS) there were—ayes 30, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to conduct as a part of the public school system a community center department, a department of school attendance and work permits, night schools, vacation schools, Americanization schools, and other activities, under and within appropriations made by Congress, and on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools to fix and prescribe the salaries, other than those herein specified, to be paid to the employees of the said activities.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in line 16, page 20, I move to strike out the words "on the recommendation of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in consultation with."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Page 20, line 16, strike out the words "on the recommendation of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in consultation with."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, only a word in this connection. The original amendment that I offered, in line 22, on page 7, was similar to the one I have now offered. The chairman of the committee [Mr. ZIHLMAN], the gentleman from Maryland, accepted it. It was objected to by another member of the committee, and it was objected to because the intent and the purpose as has been announced is to give authority to the superintendent to name these people, and over in this section, page 20, to fix and prescribe the salaries. The Board of Education is to do certain things—that is, by recommendation—not in consultation with him, but they can not do a thing until he recommends it. What can they do but what he recommends? It is admitted that that is the intention. I submit, and with all due respect to the committee, that that is too arbitrary a power to give to one man. What is the use of having a Board of Education since they are just to be an amanuensis to write down what the superintendent says he wants to do? I do not think the superintendent ought to fix the salary.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Take as an example section 15. That section provides—

That the Board of Education, on recommendation of the superintendent of schools, is hereby authorized—

To do a certain thing.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. As the bill reads, he acts as an independent body and submits it to the Board of Education. The Board of Education can do as it pleases; but under your amendment you put the superintendent of schools in as a member of the board, and if he is a strong, hard-headed man, in consultation he will run the board and do exactly what you do not want him to do.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In New York City we have a similar provision, and if a recommendation of the board of superintendents is not accepted by the board of education, all they can do is to send it back and the others must wait until the superintendents certify to something else.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from California should listen to this very forceful statement made by the gentleman from New York. They have an analogous situation in New York, he says, by which they have a board of superintendents, and the board of superintendents makes the recommendation, and the council accepts or rejects what the board says, but it can do nothing itself. It has to come back to the board, so that it will be exactly what will happen here. This superintendent will make the recommendation, as they do in New York City, and it will go to the board, and if the board rejects it, then it will have to go back to the superintendent. Everything will be done by him. The board is a mere figurehead. That is the actual practice in New York City.

Mr. RAKER. The fifteenth section provides that—

The Board of Education, on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, is hereby authorized to appoint annual substitute teachers.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The trouble with the gentleman is that he did not read half the language. It says "authorized and directed."

Mr. RAKER. It does not say anything of the kind here.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The copy I have says so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That the rates of salary herein designated shall become effective on the 1st day of July, 1924, and that the estimates of the expenditures for the operation of the public school system of the District of Columbia shall hereafter be prepared in conformity with the classification and compensation of educational employees herein provided: *Provided*, That the amounts specifically appropriated in the appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, for salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees whose salaries are fixed in the foregoing schedule, when not in conformity with the rates established by this act, are hereby reduced and increased to pay the said employees in accordance with the rates herein established during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for said purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, no teacher, school officer, or other employee of the



Board of Education whose salary is included in the foregoing schedule shall receive any increase in compensation other than as provided in this act.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIHLMAN: Page 21, strike out all after the first "Provided" in line 1 down to and including the word "further" in line 9.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will state for the benefit of the committee that this amendment is offered at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who states that the increases carried in this bill should be provided for in the deficiency bill and not in the manner provided for in this section.

Mr. MADDEN. If the language of the bill which is sought to be stricken out is allowed to remain, it will mix up the appropriation in such a way that chaos will result, whereas if it is stricken out, an estimate can be made of the excessive amount of money required to meet the new obligations, and it can be provided in addition to the regular salary without the new system being interjected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6721) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the three committee amendments, involving lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 7, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take that up later. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask a separate vote on the amendment to section 17 of the bill. I do not know the name of the gentleman who offered it.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks unanimous consent that the three amendments to which he refers be considered en bloc. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 11, strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$5,000"; line 12, strike out "\$100" and insert "\$200"; and in line 13, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$6,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 86, noes 36.

So the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment, on which a separate vote is demanded by the gentleman from Maryland, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 16, amendment offered by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Strike out the words "on the recommendation of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in consultation with."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLER) there were—ayes 73, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am a member of the committee, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. But is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. It all depends upon whether or not the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise to move to recommit?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to the bill?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, and the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

"On page 7, line 22, before the word 'authorized,' insert the word 'and' and strike out the balance of the line and add 'in consultation with the'; and in line 24, after the word 'assign,' insert 'in accordance with the provisions of this bill,' so that as amended the paragraph will read:

"SEC. 2. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized and empowered, in consultation with the superintendent of schools, to classify and assign, in accordance with the provisions of this bill, all teachers, school officers, and other employees to the salary classes and positions in the foregoing salary schedule."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, that is practically the same as the Cooper amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. TILSON. I suggest to the gentleman that he should change his amendment and insert the word "act" instead of "bill."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the word "act" instead of the word "bill."

The SPEAKER. Unless the gentleman from Indiana withdraws his motion for the previous question, the gentleman can not amend it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it for that purpose, if it does not prejudice my rights.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion of the gentleman from Texas is amended in the manner indicated.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 66, noes 63.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the announcement.

The SPEAKER. The ayes were 66, and the noes were 63, and therefore the motion to recommit is agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present, and I object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] There is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms is directed to bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 101, noes 162, not voting 169, as follows:

YEAS—101.

Abernethy	Arnold	Black, Tex.	Bowling
Allen	Bankhead	Bland	Box
Allgood	Bell	Blanton	Briggs

Browne, Wis.  
Browning  
Brum  
Busby  
Byrnes, Tenn.  
Cannon  
Carter  
Collins  
Connally, Tex.  
Convery  
Cook  
Cooper, Wis.  
Crisp  
Curry  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dickinson, Mo.  
Elliott  
Evans, Iowa  
Fisher  
French  
Gardner, Ind.  
Garner, Tex.  
Garrett, Tenn.

Gilbert  
Griffin  
Hastings  
Hill, Md.  
Hill, Wash.  
Hooker  
Howard, Nebr.  
Huddleston  
Hudspeth  
Jeffers  
Johnson, Tex.  
Jones  
Kerr  
Kincheloe  
King  
Kvale  
La Guardia  
Lanham  
Lankford  
Larsen, Ga.  
Little  
Lowrey  
Lozier

Lyon  
McKeown  
McLaughlin, Mich.  
Major, Ill.  
Major, Mo.  
Mansfield  
Milligan  
Moore, Ga.  
Morehead  
O'Connell, R. I.  
Oldfield  
Park, Ga.  
Peery  
Ragon  
Raney  
Rankin  
Reed, Ark.  
Richards  
Rogers, N. H.  
Rubey  
Salmon  
Sanders, Tex.  
Sears, Fla.

Sears, Nebr.  
Shallenberger  
Sherwood  
Stegall  
Stengle  
Stevenson  
Strong, Kans.  
Summers, Tex.  
Swank  
Thomas, Ky.  
Thomas, Okla.  
Thompson  
Tillman  
Tucker  
Underwood  
Watkins  
White, Kans.  
Williams, Tex.  
Wilson, Miss.  
Wright

Mr. Begg with Mr. Garrett of Texas.  
Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Celler.  
Mr. Denison with Mr. Hammer.  
Mr. Burton with Mr. Hawes.  
Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Favrot.  
Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Jost.  
Mr. Ransley with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.  
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Cullen.  
Mr. Britten with Mr. Lilly.  
Mr. Beedy with Mr. Gallivan.  
Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Sullivan.  
Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Morin with Mr. Brand of Georgia.  
Mr. Bixler with Mr. O'Brien.  
Mr. Seger with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.  
Mr. Sinclair with Mr. Cummings.  
Mr. Wyant with Mr. Canfield.  
Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Montague.  
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Deal.  
Mr. Rathbone with Mr. Geran.  
Mr. Perkins with Mr. McClintic.  
Mr. McLaughlin of Nebraska with Mr. Prall.  
Mr. Kutz with Mr. Croll.  
Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Fulbright.  
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Browne of New Jersey.  
Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. Clark of Florida.  
Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Barkley.  
Mr. Fenn with Mr. Evans of Montana.  
Mr. Mills with Mr. Tague.  
Mr. Frear with Mr. Oliver of New York.  
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Drane.  
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Berger.  
Mr. Perlman with Mr. Rayburn.  
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Ayres.  
Mr. Porter with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Simmons with Mr. Carew.  
Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Pou.  
Mr. Swoope with Mr. Weller.  
Mr. Winslow with Mr. Stedman.  
Mr. Wertz with Mr. Buchanan.  
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Wingo.  
Mr. Timberlake with Mr. Boylan.  
Mr. Welsh with Mr. Hayden.  
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.  
Mr. Smith with Mr. Vinson of Georgia.  
Mr. Young with Mr. Smithwick.  
Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Romjue.  
Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Doyle.  
Mr. Sweet with Mr. Davey.  
Mr. Peavey with Mr. O'Connell of New York.  
Mr. Fish with Mr. Wefald.  
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Drewry.  
Mr. Hersey with Mr. Corning.  
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Bloom.  
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Greenwood.  
Mr. Paige with Mr. Morris.  
Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Eagan.  
Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Goldsborough.  
Mr. Hickey with Mr. O'Connor of New York.  
Mr. Thatcher with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.  
Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Kindred.  
Mr. Swing with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
Mr. Yates with Mr. Lindsay.  
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. McSweeney.  
Mr. Wason with Mr. Lee of Georgia.  
Mr. Tinscher with Mr. O'Sullivan.  
Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.  
Mr. Valle with Mr. Sites.

# NAYS—162.

Ackerman  
Almon  
Aswell  
Bacon  
Barbour  
Beck  
Beers  
Black, N. Y.  
Boles  
Boyce  
Bulwinkle  
Burdick  
Burness  
Butler  
Byrnes, S. C.  
Cable  
Campbell  
Casey  
Chindblom  
Clague  
Cleary  
Collier  
Colton  
Connolly, Pa.  
Cooper, Ohio  
Cramton  
Crosier  
Dallinger  
Darrow  
Davis, Minn.  
Dickinson, Iowa  
Dickstein  
Domnick  
Doughton  
Dowell  
Driver  
Dyer  
Fairchild  
Faust  
Fitzgerald  
Fleetwood

Foster  
Free  
Frothingham  
Fulmer  
Gasque  
Gibson  
Gifford  
Glattfelder  
Green, Iowa  
Greene, Mass.  
Griest  
Hadley  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Hawley  
Hill, Ala.  
Hoch  
Hull, Iowa  
Hull, Morton D.  
Humphreys  
Jacobstein  
James  
Johnson, Ky.  
Johnson, Wash.  
Kearns  
Keller  
Kendall  
Kent  
Ketcham  
Kless  
Kopp  
Kunz  
Lampert  
Larson, Minn.  
Lazaro  
Lea, Calif.  
Leatherwood  
Leavitt  
Lehibach  
Linthicum  
Logan

Longworth  
Luce  
McDuffie  
McFadden  
McLeod  
McReynolds  
McSwain  
MacGregor  
MacLafferty  
Madden  
Magee, N. Y.  
Manlove  
Mapes  
Mead  
Michener  
Miller, Wash.  
Minahan  
Mooney  
Moore, Ohio  
Moore, Va.  
Moore, Ind.  
Morgan  
Morrow  
Mudd  
Murphy  
Nelson, Me.  
Nelson, Wis.  
Newton, Minn.  
Newton, Mo.  
Nolan  
Oliver, Ala.  
Parks, Ark.  
Patterson  
Purnell  
Quin  
Raker  
Ramseyer  
Reid, Ill.  
Roach  
Robinson, Iowa  
Robison, Ky.

Rogers, Mass.  
Sabath  
Sanders, Ind.  
Sandlin  
Schall  
Schneider  
Shreve  
Sinnott  
Snell  
Snyder  
Speaks  
Sproul, Ill.  
Stalker  
Stephens  
Strong, Pa.  
Summers, Wash.  
Taylor, Tenn.  
Temple  
Tilson  
Tydings  
Upshaw  
Vare  
Vestal  
Vincent, Mich.  
Vinson, Ky.  
Voigt  
Wainwright  
Watres  
Watson  
Weaver  
White, Me.  
Williamson  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wilson, La.  
Wolf  
Wood  
Woodruff  
Woodrum  
Zihman

# NOT VOTING—169.

Aldrich  
Anderson  
Andrew  
Anthony  
Ayres  
Bacharach  
Barkley  
Beedy  
Begg  
Berger  
Bixler  
Bloom  
Boylan  
Brand, Ga.  
Brand, Ohio  
Britten  
Browne, N. J.  
Buchanan  
Buckley  
Burton  
Canfield  
Carew  
Celler  
Christopherson  
Clancy  
Clark, Fla.  
Clark, N. Y.  
Cole, Iowa  
Cole, Ohio  
Corning  
Croll  
Crowther  
Cullen  
Cummings  
Davey  
Deal  
Dempsey  
Denison  
Doyle  
Drane  
Drewry  
Eagan  
Edmonds

Evans, Mont.  
Fairfield  
Favrot  
Fenn  
Fish  
Frear  
Fredericks  
Freeman  
Fulbright  
Fulmer  
Funk  
Gallivan  
Garber  
Garrett, Tex.  
Geran  
Goldsborough  
Graham, Ill.  
Graham, Pa.  
Greenwood  
Hammer  
Haugen  
Hawes  
Hayden  
Hersey  
Hickey  
Holaday  
Howard, Okla.  
Hudson  
Hull, Tenn.  
Hull, William E.  
Johnson, S. Dak.  
Johnson, W. Va.  
Jost  
Kahn  
Kelly  
Kindred  
Kintson  
Kurtz  
Langley  
Lee, Ga.  
Lilly  
Lindsay  
Lineberger

McClintic  
McKenzie  
McLaughlin, Nebr.  
McNulty  
McSweeney  
Magee, Pa.  
Martin  
Merritt  
Michaelson  
Miller, Ill.  
Mills  
Montague  
Moore, Ill.  
Morin  
Morris  
O'Brien  
O'Connell, N. Y.  
O'Connor, La.  
O'Connor, N. Y.  
O'Sullivan  
Oliver, N. Y.  
Paige  
Parker  
Peavey  
Perkins  
Perlman  
Phillips  
Porter  
Pou  
Prall  
Quayle  
Ransley  
Rathbone  
Rayburn  
Reece  
Reed, N. Y.  
Reed, W. Va.  
Romjue  
Rosenbloom  
Rouse  
Sanders, N. Y.  
Schaffer  
Scott

Seger  
Simmons  
Sinclair  
Sites  
Smith  
Smithwick  
Sproul, Kans.  
Stedman  
Sullivan  
Sweet  
Swing  
Swoope  
Taber  
Tague  
Taylor, Colo.  
Taylor, W. Va.  
Thatcher  
Timberlake  
Tinscher  
Tinkham  
Treadway  
Underhill  
Valle  
Vinson, Ga.  
Ward, N. C.  
Ward, N. Y.  
Wason  
Wefald  
Weller  
Welsh  
Wertz  
Williams, Ill.  
Williams, Mich.  
Wingo  
Winslow  
Winter  
Wurzbach  
Wyant  
Yates  
Young

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.  
The question was taken, and the bill was passed.  
On motion by Mr. ZIEHLMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

# EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. SEARS of Florida, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, Mr. ZIEHLMAN, and Mr. KENT were given leave to revise and extend their remarks made to-day.

# PROHIBITION.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill that I recently introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

A COMMUNICATION TO A NUMBER OF HIS CONSTITUENTS BY MR. WOLFF, OF MISSOURI, DEALING WITH THE PROHIBITION QUESTION

DEAR FRIEND: In answer to certain communications which I have received, I beg to state in the first place that I was glad to receive these candid expressions relative to the Volstead Act. I admire anyone who has the courage to express his honest opinion and who believes what he teaches and who lives in accordance with that which he preaches. I may differ from my friend on a given subject, but that is no proof that he is a scoundrel or that I am a rascal because we do not agree on everything. My father was a Presbyterian minister and an ardent prohibitionist. My dear old mother talked abstinence to me from the time I could understand until her death a number of years since.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.  
The following pairs were announced:



I desire to apologize for the length of this communication, but trust that you will be kind enough to read it carefully and thoughtfully.

The eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

"SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited."

It does not state what amount of alcohol is necessary in a beverage to make it intoxicating. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that Congress has the right, therefore, to specify the legal alcoholic content of a beverage or how much alcohol it may contain before it becomes intoxicating. The Anti-Saloon League admits that Congress, under the Constitution and the decision of the Supreme Court, has authority to pass a law legalizing 2.75 per cent beer and that such a law would be constitutional. Congress heretofore, acting under such presumed authority, fixed one-half of 1 per cent alcoholic content of beverages as an experiment.

The eighteenth amendment is truly a part of our Constitution. Everyone knows this, and all good citizens should in every way defend and uphold the provisions of that great document. The Volstead Act is the enforcement act which tells us the amount of whisky which our physicians may prescribe, how much alcohol may be used in certain medicines, extracts, beverages, etc., and provides punishment for violation thereof. It is not a part of our Constitution, as many apparently believe. It is a very drastic law enacted by Congress which it was supposed would, when enacted, immediately do away with strong alcoholic beverages and that our citizens, if not voluntarily, would in fear of its drastic penalties promptly comply with the provisions of the eighteenth amendment to our Constitution. But, my friends, have they done this? I agree with you that they should do so. But a day or so since I voted for an appropriation of an additional \$14,000,000 to our Coast Guard, making nearly \$25,000,000, to equip small boats with arms and men to further aid in attempting to prevent the smuggling of whisky into the United States. I shall help to enforce this law in every way possible, and I will say here that when I took my oath of office I made up my mind to abide by that Constitution and live in conformity with the oath I had taken. I do not advocate one thing and practice another. However, I am fully aware that anyone who wants whisky here in Washington and is willing to take the "chance" can get it at very reasonable prices—some real old-time stuff as well as other brands and grades.

Recently a member of the police department here informed me that the jail was overcrowded on all days and that they had three or four "drunks" in every cell on the previous Saturday night. It is not uncommon to see men drink more or less publicly and to see, as I have personally seen on a recent Sunday afternoon, several dozen "drunks" on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Washington Herald, March, 17, carried a headline as follows, "United States Capital 300 per cent more drunken than Paris, 2,000 per cent more more murderous than London," and gave the following statistics concerning other crimes:

"Since 1910 the population increase has been 32.17 per cent; murder has increased 291 per cent; manslaughter has increased 250 per cent; robbery has increased 103 per cent; grand larceny has increased 157 per cent; soliciting has increased 2,350 per cent; disorderly houses have increased 1,388 per cent."

These conditions exist in the Capital City of our Nation, but conditions are no worse here than in other large cities.

I am just informed by the Toledo Advertising Club, Toledo, Ohio, that within the month the Ohio State Board of Clemency has addressed a letter officially to every common pleas judge in the State requesting that the sentences of all first offenders be suspended, for the reason that there is no room left in the penal institutions of Ohio to accommodate them. It is stated that on two recent occasions the sheriff of Lucas County has been obliged to release prisoners convicted of violating the Volstead or Crabbe (Ohio) Act in order to make room for more dangerous characters. The association concludes by saying that it is believed that the adoption of the proposed change will solve many of the ills afflicting our people at the present time and encourage at least some measure of respect for the eighteenth amendment, now almost entirely lacking.

Space will not permit similar detailed recitals as to conditions in each State. However, in our own State you are, of course, familiar with the Shoup and Prather affairs.

The Washington Herald, March 28, contains the following article:

"In France alcoholism and drunkenness have been cut down 50 per cent in 10 years without prohibition. Light wines and beer are not even considered alcoholic drinks there. But absinthe has been abolished entirely. Very heavy taxes are put on brandy and other alcoholic poisons and their prices are prohibitive. France is, by one-half, more temperate than in 1914."

What would have been the result if our Government had forbidden whisky, gin, etc., absolutely, or taxed these poisons \$10 per bottle while permitting unrestricted sale of 2.75 per cent beer? Too late to ask that question now.

All over the United States young boys, who previously were not permitted in saloons, are to-day patronizing bootleggers and drinking the rottenest kinds of moonshine poisons. Young girls who previously never tasted or came directly in contact with pure liquor even are to-day drinking by the thousands, and they are now confronted with the double hazard of the deadly poisonous hip-pocket flask in the lonely, unchaperoned, converted "automobile barroom." This is certainly a matter which should receive the thoughtful consideration of all fathers and mothers. A little mild beer in the home, where desired, would not constitute such an alarming menace as the above true-to-life picture, it occurs to me.

Thousands of our best citizens are making home-brews and wines, every one of them violating the present provisions of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, as these concoctions all contain from 4 to 16 per cent alcoholic content. High Government officials, including Cabinet officers, have violated the Volstead Act. Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, and Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, have been implicated in this connection, and Mr. Daugherty has recently resigned his position because of these and other charges. Prohibition enforcement agents and political appointees have sold out and committed other crimes under the Volstead Act. Anti-saloon officials have violated the law, as well as betrayed the confidence of their people, as in the cases of Anderson, of New York; Shoup, of Missouri; and others. Maj. James F. Johnson, a high official in the central prohibition enforcement office, has just recently been exposed. God knows that as administered to date there is no such thing as actual prohibition as advocated. The periodical announcements of Commissioner Haynes as to the amount of illicit liquors and concoctions confiscated throughout the country and the number of arrests which have been made for violations of the Volstead Act throughout the United States—no State being materially better or worse than another in either respect—are conclusive as to the wholesale violations of this act.

Under date of December 21, 1923, Internal Revenue Commissioner Blair said:

"There were 187 bonded warehouses robbed from January 16, 1920, to June 30, 1923. In these robberies 134,485 gallons of spirits were stolen."

These figures evidently do not include inside robberies, such as that of the Jack Daniels Distillery, of St. Louis, from which 892 barrels of whisky were stolen last August. At the bootleg price of \$60 a gallon, the whisky extracted from the St. Louis warehouse was worth \$2,676,000, and that stolen from the Government warehouses \$8,069,100.

In Washington alone Mr. Haynes, according to his own statement, has seized approximately 15,000 gallons of whisky. He does not state how many gallons of other concoctions were confiscated, and there is no way to estimate accurately the amount of such liquors which escaped confiscation.

Recently before the Senate investigating committee witnesses testified that prohibition officials had sold stills to moonshiners and were protecting them. Witnesses before the Federal grand jury recently stated that Prohibition Agents Thomas Wheeler and George King have received for protection of whisky manufacturers over \$20,000 since last December. It is charged that men with whom Andrew W. Mellon is associated have made many thousands of dollars since the enactment of this law by illegally releasing and issuing whisky permits. It is also charged that Andrew W. Mellon and family own practically all the stock of the Overholt Distillery, one of the largest whisky manufacturers in the United States, and that they are also interested in several breweries.

Richard E. Enright, head of the New York police department, gave out a statement but a day or so since—and this man does not guess; he knows what he is talking about. He said:

"The discouraging feature of the prohibition law is that those that used intoxicating liquor moderately, or used only beer and light wine before prohibition, now drink large quantities of hard liquor of very bad quality. It is far from reassuring."

Some persons may still be more or less reluctant to accept these statements on account of the startling revelation, and because they do not personally know of such specific local instances of crime mentioned. I know that violations are not so general in my district under this law as in the large congested centers of population. That is also true with reference to other statutes. But certainly no one will urge these considerations as proof that such conditions do not exist elsewhere. The incontrovertible evidence on which a conviction is obtained in any court is always appalling, and more so when least expected. It has been charged that some of the persons who are receiving large salaries in connection with the organizations opposed to any kind of alcoholic beverages are unwilling to have all the actual facts made known to the public for fear that efforts will immediately be made to correct the situation and thereby kill the goose

that is laying the golden egg for them. I make no such charge as this, though it may be true in some few cases. Would you personally favor an investigation which would give to the public all the facts to date in connection with the attempted enforcement of this law?

Personally I am not a radical wet; neither am I a radical prohibitionist. Mr. Volstead testified before the committee during the hearings on his bill that 2.75 per cent beer was not intoxicating. Therefore an effort to legalize 2.75 per cent beer under the eighteenth amendment can not properly be construed as a thrust at the main structure. With thousands of our citizens beer is and was a beverage, as is coffee and tea with others. The Supreme Court in the case of *Ruppert v. Coffey* held that 2.75 per cent beer is not intoxicating. But, as many contend who have led it, one-half of 1 per cent beer is a tasteless product whereas 2.75 per cent beer contains enough alcohol to make it a palatable beverage and properly preserve it, and it is also nonintoxicating. Why, my friend, 20 per cent of the patent medicines on the market contain from 10 to 25 per cent alcohol as a preservative. Take down the bottles from the shelves of any drug store and examine them yourself; the alcoholic content is marked on the labels. Much of the home-brew manufactured in the homes of our best citizens has from 5 to 6 per cent alcoholic content and is therefore violative of the provisions of the Constitution and the Volstead Act.

Beer is beer whether it has one-half of 1 per cent alcoholic content as legally sold over the bars to-day or whether it has 2.75 per cent alcoholic content as advocated in the 83 bills introduced in Congress this session. These bills do not mention wine at all—beer alone. Your Representative has, with others, advocated a mild beer of 2.75 per cent alcoholic content to be sold in original packages for home use only, and these bills absolutely prohibit the sale of this beer in bar-rooms or saloons. I am advocating this change because I feel that it will do away with the sale of moonshine whisky, wines, and other poisons. It will remove from the minds of some adults the idea that we are trying to legislate morals into them and there will be no feeling of resentment on their part as is apparent at present. This change will from every viewpoint aid in the enforcement of the Volstead Act as no one will take a "chance" on the stronger poisonous concoctions if he can get wholesome beer of this kind.

I do not advocate this change as a revenue measure, the argument of the antiprohibitionists, but some revenue can be derived from this source which would tend to lower taxes. I do not advocate it for any personal reason or desire. If I wanted to use intoxicating liquor I could obtain all I want. All that is necessary is the price. As an American citizen who has carried a gun and faced an enemy of my country, whose father and grandfather before him had the same privilege, I feel it is my duty now as a legislator to protect and defend that Constitution just as much as then, but I do believe that we can best do so in this instance by regarding this particular problem as real rather than theoretical; get all the facts and then apply any remedy which may promise the desired relief. I shall not knowingly vote for any proposition that violates the provisions of the Constitution. I shall continue to stand for my people and shall endeavor to honestly represent them, still bearing in mind that there are 18 other amendments to the Constitution. I am for the enforcement of the law and shall vote for any measure that will help to accomplish this. To my mind, expressing my own humble opinion, what we need to-day is more broad minds, more of the real old-time honesty, and men in Government positions who have the courage of their convictions and who will abide by the commandments as written—

"Thou shalt not lie."

"Thou shalt not steal."

and men who will shape their actions to conform to that rule, which is as follows:

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

I honestly and truly feel that my proposal, if adopted, would materially aid in making safe, sane, and effective the actual enforcement of real prohibition, and this has not been approached to date. If my proposal does not have this effect, then I would be willing later to consider with you other means as a possible remedy. Do you consider this a fair proposal?

I desire also to call your attention to the fact that Woodrow Wilson, to my mind the greatest of all Presidents, vetoed this same Volstead law, which I am in an honorable way attempting to amend. I hardly believe that any constituent of mine will question the statesmanship of that world character, or insinuate that he was un-American because of this fact.

This letter is being mailed to several thousand people in my district, substantially an equal number in each county. A long reply is not necessary—simply answer the following questions and sign your name. Your name will not be disclosed and your answers will be regarded as confidential by me.

1. Considering all the facts herein presented, if true, would you favor a change in the Volstead law?

2. Would you favor legalizing 2.75 per cent beer if it were possible to positively guarantee that such action would improve present conditions?

3. After having read this entire statement, if you are still opposed to consideration of my proposal as a possible remedy for present evils, please state what remedy you desire to urge?

4. (Answer this question if you care to do so.) Have you in the past two years made home-brew, homemade wine, or cider, or have you taken a drink of moonshine liquor, wine, home-brew of any kind, or hard cider? (a) If you have, do you realize that this constitutes a violation of the Volstead law as written at present?

5. Are you 21 years of age or over?

May I hear from you?

Respectfully yours,

SCOTT WOLFE.

P. S.: Every statement as to every material fact herein contained is based on records and can be so verified if desired by you.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Federal Trade Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the independent offices appropriation bill (H. R. 8233), now before the House in Committee of the Whole, proposes to lop off the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission about \$200,000. It is proposed to effect this by the following limitation:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for investigations directed by the President or either House of Congress, except those authorized by law: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to investigations in progress on April 1, 1924.

Although called a "limitation" it is my opinion that this language is, in effect, a repeal of a substantial part of the law and is legislation of the most obnoxious character. It takes from the duly constituted committee of the House, having jurisdiction of the matter, its lawful and reasonable right to weigh and consider the significance of the proposed change and attempts to hurry the House into a substantial change of the law upon the pretext of economy.

The act creating the commission was passed September 26, 1914. Its five members (not more than three of whom may be of one political party) are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The act was amended by the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914; the trading with the enemy act of October 6, 1917, and the Webb-Pomerene law of April 10, 1918.

The law, as it stands, provides that investigations shall be made by the commission upon the direction of the President or either House of Congress and reports made on facts disclosed pertaining to any alleged violations of the antitrust laws.

The proposed change would strip the President, the Senate, and the House of the right to initiate such investigations, and in so far as it does that it practically repeals the law or laws under which the commission acts.

As to whether or not the commission has justified its existence, or, as to whether or not the right to initiate such investigations has been abused by the President, the Senate, or the House, I beg to submit the following summary of the commission's activities since its creation.

From the summary it will be noted:

- (a) The President initiated six investigations.
  - (b) The Senate initiated 23 investigations.
  - (c) The House initiated seven investigations.
- Total investigations, 36.

And no one can pretend that they were not of the greatest importance.

Here is the list in detail:

MEMORANDUM OF INQUIRIES MADE BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AT THE ORDER OF THE CONGRESS, THE PRESIDENT, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, UP TO MARCH 28, 1924.

#### PETROLEUM.

(S. Res. 457, 63d Cong., 2d sess.)

Acting under this resolution, the commission published a report on gasoline prices in 1915, which discussed the high prices of petroleum products and showed how the various Standard Oil Companies had continued to maintain a division of marketing territory among themselves. The commission suggested several plans for restoring effective competition in the oil industry.



## SISAL HEMP.

(S. Res. 170, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

This resolution called on the commission to assist the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by advising how certain quantities of hemp, promised by the Mexican Sisal Trust, might be fairly distributed among American manufacturers of binder twine.

## ANTHRACITE.

(S. Res. 217, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

The rapid advance in the prices of anthracite at the mines, compared with costs, and the extortionate overcharging of anthracite jobbers and dealers were disclosed in this inquiry, and a system of current reports called for regarding selling prices which substantially checked further exploitation of the consumer.

## BITUMINOUS COAL.

(H. Res. 352, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

While this resolution aimed originally at the investigation of the alleged depressed condition of the bituminous coal industry, the inquiry had not been long underway before there was a great advance in prices, and the commission in its report suggested various measures for insuring a more adequate supply at reasonable prices.

## NEWSPRINT PAPER.

(S. Res. 177, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

The newsprint-paper inquiry resulted from an unexpected advance in prices. The report of the commission showed that these prices were very profitable, and that they had been partly the result of certain newsprint association activities which were in restraint of trade. The Department of Justice instituted proceedings in consequence of which the association was abolished.

## BOOK PAPER.

(S. Res. 269, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

The inquiry into book paper which was made shortly after the newsprint inquiry, had a similar origin and disclosed similar restraints of trade, resulting in proceedings by the commission against the manufacturers involved therein. The commission also recommended further legislative action to repress restraints of trade by such associations.

## FLAGS.

(S. Res. 35, 65th Cong., 1st sess.)

A sudden increase in the prices of American flags led to this inquiry, which disclosed that while a trade association had been active to fix prices shortly before, the price advance had been so great on account of the war demand that further price fixing had been superfluous.

## MEAT-PACKING PROFIT LIMITATIONS.

(S. Res. 177, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

The inquiry into meat-packing profit limitations had as its object the study of the system of war-time control established by the Food Administration; certain changes were recommended by the commission, including more complete control of the business and lower maximum profits.

## FARM IMPLEMENTS.

(S. Res. 223, 65th Cong., 2d sess.)

The high prices of farm implements led to this inquiry, which disclosed that there were numerous trade combinations to advance prices and that the consent decree for the dissolution of the International Harvester Co. was absurdly inadequate. The commission recommended a revision of the decree, and the Department of Justice is now proceeding against the company to that end.

## MILK.

(S. Res. 431, 65th Cong., 3d sess.)

This inquiry into the fairness of milk prices to producers and of canned milk to consumers and whether they were affected by fraudulent or discriminatory practices resulted in a report showing marked concentration of control.

## COTTON YARN.

(H. Res. 451, 66th Cong., 2d sess.)

The House called on the commission to investigate the very high prices of combed cotton yarn, and the inquiry disclosed that the profits in the industry had been extraordinary large for several years.

## PACIFIC COAST PETROLEUM.

(S. Res. 138, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

On the Pacific coast the great increase in the prices of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products led to this inquiry which disclosed that several of the companies were fixing prices.

## PETROLEUM PRICES.

(H. Res. 501, 66th Cong., 2d sess.)

This was another inquiry into high prices for petroleum products. The report of the commission pointed out that the Standard companies

practically made the prices in their several marketing territories and avoided competition among themselves. Various constructive proposals to conserve the oil supply were made by the commission.

## COMMERCIAL FEEDS.

(S. Res. 140, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

The inquiry into commercial feeds which aimed to discover whether there were any combinations or restraints of trade in that business was diligently pursued, and though it disclosed some association activities in restraint of trade it found no important violation of the antitrust laws.

## SUGAR SUPPLY.

(H. Res. 150, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

The ordinary advance in the price of sugar in 1919 led to this inquiry, which was found to be due chiefly to speculation and hoarding in sugar, and certain recommendations were made for legislative action to cure these abuses.

## SOUTHERN LIVESTOCK PRICES.

(S. Res. 133, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

The low prices of Southern livestock which gave rise to the belief that discrimination was being practiced were investigated, but the alleged discrimination did not appear to exist.

## SHOE COSTS AND PRICES.

(H. Res. 217, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

The high prices of shoes after the war led to this inquiry, and the investigation of the commission attributed them chiefly to supply and demand conditions.

## TOBACCO PRICES.

(H. Res. 533, 66th Cong., 2d sess.)

The House called upon the commission to make inquiry into the prices of leaf tobacco and the selling prices of tobacco products. The unfavorable relationship between them was reported to be due in part to the purchasing methods of the large tobacco companies, and as a result of this inquiry the commission recommended that the decree dissolving the old Tobacco Trust should be amended and alleged violations of the existing decree prosecuted. Better systems of grading tobacco were also recommended by the commission.

## TOBACCO PRICES.

(S. Res. 129, 67th Cong., 1st sess.)

This inquiry was also directed to the low prices of leaf tobacco and the high prices of tobacco products. It disclosed that in the sale of tobacco several of the largest companies were engaged in numerous conspiracies with their customers—the jobbers—to enhance the selling prices of tobacco. Proceedings against these unlawful acts were instituted by the commission.

## EXPORT GRAIN.

(S. Res. 133, 67th Cong., 2d sess.)

The low prices of export wheat gave rise to this inquiry, which developed extensive and harmful speculative manipulation of prices on the grain exchanges and conspiracies among country grain buyers to agree on maximum prices for grain purchased. Legislation for a stricter supervision of grain exchanges was recommended, together with certain changes in the rules. The commission also recommended governmental action looking to additional storage facilities for grain uncontrolled by grain dealers.

## HOUSE FURNISHINGS.

(S. Res. 127, 67th Cong., 2d sess.)

The failure of house-furnishing goods to decline in price since 1920 as much as most other commodities, alleged to be due to restraints of trade, was inquired into by the commission, and one report has already been issued regarding household furniture, which shows that extensive conspiracies existed under the form of cost-accounting devices and meetings, to inflate the price of such furniture. The commission has announced that it is continuing this inquiry into certain other kinds of house furnishings.

## FLOUR MILLING.

(S. Res. 212, 67th Cong., 2d sess.)

This inquiry into the flour-milling industry has not yet been reported on.

## COTTON TRADE.

(S. Res. 262, 67th Cong., 2d sess.)

The investigation of the cotton trade has not been completed, but a preliminary report was issued which showed a marked degree of concentration in the cotton-merchandising business.

## FERTILIZER.

(S. Res. 307, 67th Cong., 2d sess.)

The fertilizer inquiry developed that active competition generally prevailed in the industry in this country, though in foreign countries combinations control some of the most important raw materials. The

commission recommended constructive legislation to improve agricultural credits and the advantages of more extended cooperative action in the purchase of fertilizer by farmers.

#### FOREIGN OWNERSHIP IN PETROLEUM INDUSTRY.

(S. Res. 311, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.)

The acquisition of extensive oil interests in this country by the Dutch-Snell concern, an international trust, and discrimination practiced against Americans in foreign countries provoked this inquiry which developed the situation.

#### COTTON TRADE.

(S. Res. 429, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.)

The inquiry in response to this second resolution on the cotton trade has not yet been completed.

#### NATIONAL WEALTH.

(S. Res. 451, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.)

This subject has not yet been reported.

#### CALCIUM ARSENATE.

(S. Res. 417, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.)

The high prices of calcium arsenate, a poison used to destroy the cotton boll weevil, led to this inquiry, from which it appeared that the cause was due to the sudden increase in demand rather than to any restraints of trade.

#### RADIO.

(H. Res. 548, 67th Cong., 4th sess.)

The patents in the radio industry, which the commission was called upon to investigate by this resolution, were found to be controlled by a combination of a few great companies, as also commercial communication by radio. The commission since issuing the report has instituted proceedings against these companies. These facts are of vital importance in considering what legislation shall be now provided for the regulation of the radio industry.

#### BREAD.

(S. Res. 163, 68th Cong., 1st sess.)

This bread inquiry has not yet been actively undertaken, according to an official report to the Senate, on account of insufficient funds.

#### FOOD INQUIRY.

(Direction of the President, February 7, 1917.)

The President's food inquiry, undertaken with a special appropriation of Congress, resulted in a very important series of reports on the meat-packing industry, which had as their immediate result the enactment of the packers and stockyards act for the control of this industry and the prosecution of the big packers for a conspiracy in restraint of trade by the Department of Justice. Another branch of the food inquiry developed important facts regarding the grain trade which was of assistance to Congress in regulating the grain exchanges and to the courts in interpreting the law.

(Direction of the President, July 25, 1917.)

The numerous cost investigations made by the Federal Trade Commission during the war into the coal, steel, lumber, petroleum, cotton textiles, locomotives, leather, canned foods, and copper industries not to mention scores of other important industries, on the basis of which prices were fixed by the food administration, the war industries board, and the purchasing departments, like the Army, Navy, Shipping Board and Railroad Administration, were all done under the President's special direction, and it is estimated that they helped to save the country many billions of dollars by checking unjustifiable price advances.

#### WHEAT PRICES.

(Direction of President, October 12, 1920.)

The extraordinary decline of wheat prices in the summer and autumn of 1920 led to a direction of the President to inquire into the reasons for the decline. The chief reasons for the decline were found in abnormal market conditions, including certain arbitrary methods pursued by the grain-purchasing departments of foreign governments.

#### GASOLINE.

(Direction of President, February 7, 1924.)

At the direction of the President, the commission recently undertook an inquiry into the recent sharp advance in gasoline prices. This inquiry is still in progress.

#### RAISIN COMBINATION.

(Request of the Attorney General, September 30, 1919.)

A combination of raisin growers in California was referred to the commission for examination by the Attorney General, pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission act, and the commission found that it was not only organized in restraint of trade but was being conducted in a manner that was threatening financial disaster to the growers. The commission recommended a change of organization to conform to the law, which was adopted by the raisin growers.

#### LUMBER INDUSTRY.

(Request of the Attorney General, September 4, 1919.)

At the request of the Attorney General the commission examined certain alleged trade combinations in the lumber industry. Violations of the antitrust acts were disclosed with respect to the Southern Pine Association, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, Western Pine Manufacturers' Association, Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, Western Red Cedar Association, Lifetime Post Association, and Western Red Cedar Men's Information Bureau.

The Department of Justice has already initiated proceedings in consequence of the commission's recommendations with respect to the Southern Pine Association and the Western Pine Manufacturers' Association.

#### REGULATION OF CHILD LABOR.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the proposed constitutional amendment regarding child labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, this proposition to adopt another amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to confer upon the Congress the power to regulate child labor in every nook and corner of the United States and in every possible field of activity in which children may be gainfully employed raises a fundamental question and requires careful and cautious consideration before action.

#### GENERAL GOVERNMENT STRICTLY FEDERAL.

Undoubtedly the framers of the Constitution of the United States, and I mean not only those who sat in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 but more especially the members of the conventions in the several States called for the purpose of considering whether or not each State would ratify said proposed Constitution—all these framers, and more especially the people whom these conventions represented, considered this new Government of the United States being created, not only a Federal Government with limited powers but more especially a sort of international arrangement between the constituent States to render them more effective in the prosecution of war for their common defense. They realized that they had won independence solely by reason of cooperation, loose and imperfect as it was, between the several Colonies, now calling themselves "States," since their common Declaration of Independence, and they believed that so soon as the hereditary monarchies of Europe should find surcease from the destructions of the French Revolution and the subsequent Napoleonic wars that the European dynasties would probably combine to crush "this hotbed of Yankee democracy." They perceived that there was an essential and inevitable conflict between the principle of human freedom and the doctrine of divine right of kings. The States felt no need of cooperation for the promotion of their internal economic and social well-being. They were then conferring and protecting individual liberty and personal freedom as no government had ever done before. But they did realize that as the sole exponents of republican institutions and democratic ideals in the New World, and practically in the whole world, that their cause of freedom and their fight for the preservation of independence was a common cause and should be carried on by a common effort.

#### WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING

With the economic changes that have followed the progress of civilization since that time, there has been a constant drift of governmental power concerning economic matters and human rights and duties and privileges, and no thoughtful student of the history of this constant tendency toward centralization can contemplate the present vast volume of power exercised by the executive bureaus of the Federal Government, and the vast volume of taxes necessary to keep these bureaus and their activities going, and the vast volume of personal liberties and individual rights that come under the regulations of the mighty bureaus, without dreading the ultimate consequences of this concentrating tendency.

#### PREVIOUS CHILD LABOR LAWS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

When matters come up like the antilynching bill, we can consider them first of all from their constitutionality, and it seems that the unconstitutionality of the bill mentioned can be demonstrated to a practical, mathematical certainty. Consequently, so long as Congress thought that it might by indirection, under the guise of regulating interstate commerce and next under the guise of the taxing power, legislate upon the subject of child labor, the question could then be debated upon constitutional grounds. However, the Supreme Court having declared the indirect legislation, based upon the interstate commerce and taxation powers, both futile and insidious assaults upon the reserve rights of the States, and therefore



idle and ineffectual efforts to augment Federal power, now two classes of persons have come forward with the proposition to change the Federal Constitution itself by adding a twentieth amendment to confer upon Congress the right, and therefore the duty to enact legislation regarding child labor.

#### WHENCE THIS AGITATION

What are these two classes? First, well-intentioned and unselfish people who are driven on by a benevolent zeal which has misguided them and led them to overlook the great fundamental American scheme of State and Federal Government and caused them to seek in this wrong way to do the right thing. I do not question their motive, but I do condemn their method. The next class consists of certain selfish interests which have found themselves in a losing game of competition with industries and activities in other parts of the country, and in the fight of self-defense they are seeking to level down by national legislation their competing industries. Thus, by seeking by legislation to deprive their competitors of the benefits of certain natural and economic advantages and to protect themselves against the otherwise inexorable laws of political economy.

#### WHEN AND WHERE SHALL WE DRAW THE LINE

But we are now face to face with the proposition upon its original merits. We must decide upon some line of demarcation between State power and Federal power. Shall we agree to continue this process of building higher and stronger the structure of Federal Government? Shall we permit the powers of the several States to be constantly and increasingly sapped and destroyed? Shall we subject the rights and interests and liberties and personal freedom of the individual citizens of all these 48 States and Territories, now numbering more than 100,000,000 and perhaps to number probably 200,000,000 in the next 100 years, to be subjected to, regulated by, and to derive their powers and privileges from a Federal bureau located in Washington, bound hand and foot by red tape, and slowly grinding out action according to the whim and fancy of each separate and changing bureau chief?

#### SYMPATHY FOR CHILDREN

My opposition to this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not arise from any lack of sympathy for the poor children, wherever they may be, who are compelled to labor long hours under harsh and insanitary conditions. In fact, my opposition is largely based on an intense and burning sympathy for such unfortunate children and for their unfortunate parents, and my hope and aim is to preserve to these very people the right to exert some influence through the legislatures of their respective States in formulating the laws that shall regulate them and the industries in which they labor. If this matter becomes a national proposition, then the laws of Congress will be uniform all over the whole country and will have to apply to the cane fields of Louisiana and the cornfields of Iowa. There will be the same laws for the fruit growers of California and the cotton growers of the Carolinas. There will be the same regulations for the truckers of New England and the ranchers of Texas. It is therefore manifest that what will suit the people of one State and of one section must be unsuited to the people of another State and of another section. The industries are different, the climate is different, and, in a certain sense, the people themselves are different, having different racial ancestry, different local traditions, and different provincial customs. Therefore, my great aim is to preserve to the industrial workers of South Carolina, who labor largely in the cotton mills and whose influence is powerful and well-nigh dominant within the State itself, and where they certainly hold the balance of political power, so that these industrial workers of my State may be able to have such legislation formulated by their representatives assembled in Columbia as will suit the people of South Carolina.

#### WHY DISTRUST STATE LEGISLATURES

Surely the people of each State are willing to trust their own State legislatures in these domestic matters. Surely the voice of an industrial class in a State of about 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 people will be more powerful in the State legislature in procuring favorable conditions and hours and wages for children and favorable regulations for school attendance by the children than will their voice be in the National Congress, representing 105,000,000 people. For one, I believe that the people of South Carolina are glad to submit all such matters to the Legislature of South Carolina. They remember—and when I say they I mean mothers and fathers and children themselves—some of the arbitrary and unreasonable requirements of the inspectors sent out from Washington during the period when they were seeking to enforce

Federal legislation in all the States. Many mothers told me that their sons had attended the school for the full period of the school, in most cases at least seven months for the year, and for the other five months these fine, strong sons over 14 and under 16 years of age were not permitted to labor to earn money to help support themselves and their mothers and younger brothers and sisters, to help buy their own clothes, but were roaming around the villages, wasting money, and wearing out their own clothes, learning evil practices and bad language, and yet their own mothers were standing at the spinning frame or watching the loom or counting in the cloth room to earn a livelihood for themselves and for these vigorous, able-bodied boys and for the younger brothers and sisters of these same boys.

#### WILL NECESSITATE MORE TAX EATERS

Then, if this amendment should be adopted by the States and Congress will pass these laws regulating child labor, and then to enforce these laws will put another army of clerks and bureau chiefs and field inspectors at work, I ask such industrial workers and their friends as may favor this bill: Who will be these inspectors? Will these inspectors be black or white? Will they be refined and cultivated people with a sense of decency, or will they be ruffians, practicing and pulling off military "rough stuff"?

#### TAX-CONSUMING PAY ROLLS

We must stop somewhere this centralizing process. Already the cost of maintaining the Federal Government is terrific. With over 550,000 civilian employees of the Government, with perhaps another 100,000 officials of high and low degree, with an Army of about 136,000 officers and men, with a Navy of near the same strength in numbers, with a war debt of about \$23,000,000,000, the people of this country are staggering under a burden of taxation for maintaining their various local governments and schools and their county and State governments, and when the Federal Government is piled up on top of that we pay \$70 per capita, which means about \$350 upon the average family of five. We thus see the danger of continuing to pile duties upon the Federal Government. Already the Federal Government has its hands full, and due to the huge bureaus with their thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of employees, corruption and graft have crept in and are hard to eradicate. The recent exposures in well-nigh every branch of the Federal Government should warn the people against the dangers of continuing to concentrate Federal power. The State governments are relatively clean and far more economical. The reason is obvious. The State governments are close to the people, where they can keep an eye upon them and see that every dollar brings at least 95 per cent of value in service or commodities. But the Federal Government is far removed; its processes are dark and devious and its agents are multitudinous and its money seems vast, and so the individual citizen is swallowed up by the mighty mass of Federal activities and is unable to check up on Federal expenditures. But those who have been in the service of the Federal Government here for long years and have watched the tide rise and fall will advise you that of every dollar that is spent by the Federal Government it is not likely that the people receive more than 75 per cent, if that much, in service and commodities. Already the people of the United States are paying in taxes to support their Government \$1 out of every \$8 that they earn.

A large part of this expense is due to duplication of activities between the Federal Government and the State governments. Practically every State has its department of agriculture. Every State has a department of industry. There are State geologists and State foresters, State road commissioners, and commissioners of education. So on through the whole list every State within itself duplicates practically all the Federal offices. The net result is this enormous burden of taxation.

#### FEDERAL EFFICIENCY A MYTH

Those well-meaning persons who wish this constitutional amendment passed to confer power upon Congress to regulate child labor should not deceive themselves into thinking that the Federal Government can and will perform duties along this line more efficiently and economically than the States can. The efficiency of the Federal Government is a mere myth. All who have had dealings and transactions in any way with the Veterans' Bureau of the Federal Government can testify that this so-called efficiency is a farce. Those who have had transactions with the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Federal Government can assure us that the so-called Federal efficiency is a fiction and fancy. Those who know about the Federal administration of the railroads, and the graft and corruption, the bribery and perjury that have been practiced by and upon

the agent and employees of the Federal Government seeking to enforce Federal prohibition, know that so-called Federal efficiency is an idle dream. I would not be mistaken. The people of this country have already spoken on the question of prohibition through their action in ratifying the eighteenth amendment and I am for its strict and rigid enforcement at any expense and sacrifice. But as to this present proposition to amend the Federal Constitution regarding child labor, we are now at the proper stage for debate. We can now consider the question on its merits. I am not only opposed to the amendment on its merits, but I am opposed to submitting it to the several State legislatures, or to conventions called in the States, for the purpose of considering it, because I believe that it will be dangerous to the liberties and interests of all the people of the Nation, and especially most dangerous to those very laboring people in the States whom certain selfish economic interests that are in a death grapple with economic competitors claim, as I believe hypocritically, that they are seeking to serve.

#### PERSONAL LIBERTY IN DANGER

This question of Federal centralization is vital, especially on the question of personal liberty and individual freedom. Americanism means individualism. America is another word for opportunity. America was the first and to-day is the foremost country in the world in affording a chance to the individual man or woman to make of himself and for himself all that his talents and industry and character can achieve. If we continue the process of building up a great bureaucratic, machine government in Washington that binds itself with bundles of red tape, these in turn will in time bind individual citizens with the bands of despotism, the unifying, soul-crushing, spirit-killing rules and regulations by bureaucratic despots. The State governments have their bureaus too, but they are relatively small, on an average being only a one forty-eighth part as large as the Federal bureaus. Therefore State officials can afford forty-eight times as much freedom for action and decision upon the merits and demerits of individual cases.

#### KILLING BY ADMINISTRATION THE WILL OF CONGRESS

Furthermore, Congress may make laws that seems just, but Federal bureaus by construction and regulation whittle down these laws or stiffen up these laws as they desire, so that their operation on the people is very different from what Congress intends. Witness the application of the reclassification act for harmonizing and equalizing the pay of the civil services of the United States. Within less than a year after its enactment the author of the bill, Mr. LEHLBACH himself, in most vigorous language upon the floor of this House, denounced the very board created by the bill as having acted contrary to the express authority and the direct mandates of the bill. Witness the various decisions and regulations of the Veterans' Bureau with regard to rehabilitation, and hospitalization, and compensation. Those well-intentioned people who want to impose additional powers and duties upon the Federal Government in regard to such matters as marriage and divorce, the qualifications, employment, and dismissal of teachers, the labor of women and children, the control and management of schools, and many other such fields of activity relating to the internal, intimate, domestic affairs and policies of the people themselves, relating to those subjects that come home close to the bosoms and breasts of men and women, those misguided people need to study the inside management of some of these bureaus in Washington to realize the mighty mistake that they are laboring under and leading others into.

#### A WARNING FROM HISTORY

There is another danger ahead that the wise person must heed. We must learn lessons from the history of our own country and of other countries. We have no way of judging the future except by the past. We realize that human nature is everywhere, all over the world, the same. If we continue this consolidating, concentrating, centralizing process of piling up power after power in the hands of the Federal Government, then finally some single man will snatch the reins of power, will overthrow parliamentary government, will set up a dictatorship, will establish a monarchy, will proclaim himself to be a king, and will fix upon posterity a royal dynasty to rule our children's children. This is no wild dream. It happened in France twice. First in the case of Napoleon Bonaparte, and next in the case of his nephew, Louis Napoleon. Let this centralizing tendency in the United States continue until the civil-service employees shall number 1,000,000 and the official appointees shall number 200,000 and the Army shall number one-half million and the Navy one-quarter of a million, and until all the financing of the Nation shall center in Washington, until all the industries shall center in Washington, until all the sociologi-

cal activities shall center in Washington; when the laws regulating parents and child, husband and wife, guardian and ward, teacher and student, master and servant, carrier and passenger, seller and buyer, landlord and tenant, pastor and flock, pulpit and pew, and every conceivable relation shall be centered in governmental bureaus in Washington, and then some individual with powerful personality will become President. He will serve the limit of two terms, set by George Washington's example; his ambition will not have been satisfied; he will gather into his hands the reins of official and political power, manipulate the convention of his party, have himself nominated for a third term, and then his appointees and those seeking appointment, all this vast horde of a million civil-service officials and all the influence of the Army and the Navy exerted by their personnel upon their families, relatives, and friends back home through systematic correspondence, all these avenues of appeal and approach to the public mind will be employed to insure the election of this vigorous, powerful person to be President for a third term. Then he will know the game. Then he will set in motion a sentiment to have himself proclaimed dictator.

He will spring up as another Mussolini. He would be a Lenin in American clothes. He would be a General Rivera of an American edition. He would be our modern Napoleon. He would make the people demand his continuance in office. He would compel the people to cry for his crowning. He might pretend thrice to deny the kingly crown but finally all personal scruples would be overcome and he would yield to a self-made sentiment for his enthronement and thus would end American liberty. Then would die personal freedom. In this grave would be buried the hopes of our fathers who fled to this unwelcome land 300 years ago. There would be embalmed the bright promises that found birth in the Declaration of Independence. Those who follow this centralizing tendency, who urge this augmentation of Federal power, are treading the pathway that other peoples have trod, that finally led them to despotism and to the destruction of liberty. I can not believe that the American people, when they are correctly informed and cautioned, will continue this movement to enlarge Federal power. I believe that in some respects the pendulum will swing backward. It is true that inventions and the progress of civilization have so changed matters that certain activities of the people had to be brought under Federal regulation, and in time certain other changes may produce like results. But no railroad, or steamboat, or telegraph, or telephone, or automobile has ever changed the status of a child to ward its parents. These things have not changed the nature of the home. They have not modified the feelings of the mother's heart. They have not lessened the duties of fatherhood nor weakened the love of motherhood. These intimate personal matters must be left to the States, where the States are in close touch with the people and with the local sentiments and desires and needs of the people. Where climatic changes, and seasonable changes, and industrial changes, and commercial changes, and educational changes, and all the vicissitudes incident to progress may produce quick and accurate response and reflection upon the statute books of the several States.

#### MY OPPOSITION BASED ON PRINCIPLE, NOT EXPEDIENCY

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand upon this principle of local self-government. I stand for the liberties of the individual citizen. I stand for the integrity of the American home. I stand for the independence of the mothers and fathers in the several States and for the rights of the States, in close touch with these mothers and fathers, to regulate such matters as marriage and divorce, parent and child, guardian and ward, teacher and pupil, and the thousand other like things. I maintain that it is not only the right of the State inherently to do these things but it is the duty of the State to do it, and it is the duty of the people of the State to see that the State governments discharge this duty. There is nothing to hinder and everything to encourage the people of any industrial class or group in any village or community in South Carolina to select one of their fellow citizens, living among them, knowing their conditions, and in sympathy with their needs, and to offer this citizen, either man or woman, as a candidate for the State legislature or the State senate upon a platform for the regulation of child labor in such a way as will meet the needs and desires of these people. In fact, that is what has been done in scores of cases in South Carolina and is being done constantly and will happen all over South Carolina in 1924. The laws of South Carolina for the protection of the home are the best in the whole Nation. South Carolina stands alone among all her sister States in her determination to abide by the old faith that man and woman once wed shall continue such until death. We recognize no divorce. We grant no divorce. We stand for the integrity of



the home, and though in a few instances the personal convenience and feelings of the husband and wife may suffer a lifetime sacrifice, yet it is all for the public good and for the good of the children, and in the end society is promoted, virtue is sustained, and the chivalry of manhood and the glory of womanhood preserved and magnified. Coming from South Carolina, knowing the sentiments of her people, I am opposed to this constitutional amendment.

I know how the people who labor in the factories, who work up and down the alleys between the whirring, humming, roaring machinery, feel. I know how the farmer and his wife and children in the far-flung fields of the coastal plains and the Piedmont region feel. I know how the people in the country home and in the village and town and city feel. I know that they have confidence in their State legislature. I know that they realize that the best agency to preserve their liberty, to meet their local needs, to promote their peculiar welfare is their own State government, elected by themselves, paid for by themselves, and supported by their own cooperation in the enforcement of their own laws. I believe that this is the very essence of Americanism. I believe that America is great because the fathers wisely divided the powers of government between the Federal Government and State governments. They gave to the Federal Government those general powers relating to the common defense, relating to international relations and to interstate commerce. All other powers they reserved to the people of the States, and this meant that the people of Nevada could have divorce laws if they wanted them, but the people of South Carolina could prohibit divorces if they wanted to. It means that the people of Massachusetts could have colored and white children in the same schools if they wanted to, but not so the people of South Carolina. It means that the people of Illinois might have colored and white people riding side by side in the same train, in the same Pullman sleeping coach, or in the same street car, but not so in South Carolina. This is but an illustration of what I mean by local self-government. This is what I mean by conforming law to local conditions and local traditions and local sentiment. This is the very heart and substance of the things spoken of in the Declaration of Independence. This is the thing for which the continental heroes followed George Washington through seven long years of strife and bloodshed to establish. This is the principle that has inspired the American people from their first footing upon these shores until this good day. And if we allow a few misguided zealots, whose purpose and motives may be good, but whose plan and method are full of danger and peril, to rush us on into the concentration and consolidation of power in the hands of the Federal Government, upon these matters that relate to the intimate, close, personal affairs of the people, then Bunker Hill should be and will be forgotten.

Then Yorktown will no longer be one of the bright pages of world history. Then the Declaration of Independence will be as vain a declamation as were the wild words of Abbe Sieyès. Then we turn our back on all history. Then we ignore the present-day lessons of the British Empire. Then we will be unworthy of those great judges that have sat upon the Supreme Court of this Republic and have proclaimed from the beginning that ours is a Government of limited powers, that we are a sovereign Nation, consisting of 48 sovereign States, that ours is an indestructible union of indestructible States; that the States in their integrity are as much an object of the Union's care as the Government itself created by the Union. When the States cease to exist as such, the Union ceases. That the States derive their power from the people of the States, and not from the Constitution of the United States. When we leave the plain and safe track of local self-government, which is but another word for "State rights," when we enter upon the untried field of consolidation, then we need not be surprised, and we must expect, if history continues to repeat itself, that we shall go the way of other nations, of first falling into despotic hands and, then following the deceitful ways of ambition, be crushed by some greater power or aggregation of powers.

#### AS NATIONAL POWER RISES STATE POWER FALLS

My opposition to the concentration of so much power in the administrative bureaus in Washington grows out of the fact that it spells a corresponding diminution of power in the States. The enlargement of one means the shrinking of the other. My views are not based upon tradition or sectional prejudice or historic schisms. My views are based upon grounds of public policy. They grow out of a conception of government, and are developed in the light of our historic experience. Those who framed our system of government were not inspired, but they were truly wise men. It was no accident that their work provoked that great encomium spoken by William E. Gladstone. They had had experience through the trying years of the Revolu-

tion. They had helped to establish republican institutions in the thirteen original States, and had erected governments therein founded upon written constitutions. They had studied the science of government as taught by Locke and Montesquieu. They had studied the history of the great republics, ancient and modern, and they came together with the deliberate purpose of establishing a more perfect union, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, and to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. How well they have accomplished those aims is manifested by the marvelous development of this country since that day in every direction. Our territory has been multiplied many times; our population has grown with our territory; and our institutions have expanded to the changing circumstances of science and civilization. Though it took more than half a century of debate and discussion and four years of civil war to settle forever in the minds of all the people the proper constitutional status of the States within the Union, yet that status is established and has solemnly been declared time and time again to be "an indestructible union of indestructible States."

#### THE STATES INSURE LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Now, the existence of 48 States, with the power reserved to them under the Federal Constitution to legislate upon the mass of domestic concerns, is the chief guaranty to the people of this Union of the right of local self-government. Local self-government is the inheritance of all Anglo-Saxon people; it is the nursery of Anglo-Saxon liberty; it is the school of Anglo-Saxon citizenship; it is the source of our American strength. There is danger in solidifying government. The minority, which might consist of more than 50,000,000 people, would be too large and too well organized to submit freely and easily to the domination of a majority. But when this minority of 50,000,000 people is broken up into 48 different fractions, and where the people in the 48 different States are divided perhaps upon 48 different questions, cooperation among these minorities will be practically impossible, and the general submission to the will of the majority is accomplished. Furthermore, with a consolidated Republic seeking to legislate upon myriads of matters relating to life, liberty, and property, it would be impossible to frame general legislation so as to take care of the diverse rights, the multifarious interests, and the varying feelings of the people in all parts of the country. We must remember that people are more concerned about laws and their administration as they relate to the intimate domestic relations and business concerns than they are about national affairs. Therefore the people might easily become aroused and angered and enraged beyond the point of control by nation-wide legislation affecting the status of marriage, or the relation of parent and child, or of master and servant, or of employer and employee. But where these matters are legislated upon in 48 different States this feeling is broken up into 48 different fractions, and the ship of State goes on without feeling the slightest tremor of excitement. Rome recognized the necessity of letting her colonial provinces and her subject peoples live under their traditional laws. Great Britain, with her far-flung Empire, recognizes the same principle. We see her to-day voluntarily voting autonomy for a part of the United Kingdom, and giving to the Irish people the chance to be governed by their own representatives. There is much diversity in this Nation between the cavalier of Virginia and the frontiersman of those great new empire States of the West. There is a great difference between the modern New England Puritan and the Latin peoples of Louisiana and other Southwestern States. There is a difference between the all-white population of the Northern and Northwestern States and the biracial population of the Southern States. There is a difference between the population of the East with the large percentage of foreigners and the native-born American population of the South. Nation-wide legislation can not properly regulate such a diverse people if it applies to the matters that come home to the breasts and bosoms of men, to the domestic and business affairs of the people.

#### THE STATES AS "INSULATED CHAMBERS" OF EXPERIMENT

The 48 States pursue their several ways in the development of government, constituting a great experiment station for each other. One State enacts novel and so-called radical legislation, and if the same is a failure the other 47 States are unhurt; but if the same proves wise and progressive, the other 47 States may profit by the example. In this connection I quote an extract from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in the case of *Truax against Corrigan*, decided on December 19, 1921, as follows:

I must add one general consideration. There is nothing that I more deprecate than the use of the fourteenth amendment beyond the absolute compulsion of its words to prevent the making of social experi-

ments that an important part of the community desires, in the insulated chambers afforded by the several States, even though the experiments may seem futile or even noxious to me and to those whose judgment I most respect.

#### THE STATES AND NATION AS MUTUAL CHECKS

The checks and balances established by the Federal Constitution within the Federal Government itself have often been commended as the agencies for restraining the radical and revolutionary spirit that seems to rise periodically in the breasts of the people. But the establishment of the Federal system whereby the National Government is restrained within the sphere marked out by the Federal Constitution and all the rest of sovereign power confined to the several States is a masterpiece in the way of creating checks and balances. It is entirely within the bounds of our history to say that the Federal Government at times comes under the domination and control of ultraradical sentiment and at other times under ultrareactionary control and domination. For illustration: It usually happens that while the Federal Government is under control of some dominant passion about one-half of the State governments remain dominated by contrary ideas and governmental policy. Under such conditions assume there be no restraint and boundary to the powers that Congress may exercise and that the other branches of Government may exercise in the administration of congressional legislation, then you will find legislation of ultraradical and idealistic policies enacted by Congress, and through the breach now proposed to be made in the defenses of State rights such congressional legislation will be driven into the States themselves, and the States (which are still the citadels of conservatism) will by Federal power be forced into the line and ranks of the radicals.

#### HOW THE STATES AND THE NATIONS MUTUALLY ACT AND REACT

But, on the other hand, preserve to the States their constitutional power and even if the Federal Government does for a time fall into the hands of the ultraradical or the ultraconservative, still about one-half of the States will continue to be the strongholds of the contrary ideas, and from these strongholds may sally forth the champions of their cause and by reason thereof in a few years a majority of the people of the whole Nation may be convinced that a change of administration in the National Government is desirable. By reason of this condition we may fairly expect slow but continuous progress in our republican institutions. It was Aristotle who said that a monarchy is a swift sailboat that outruns all the other barks upon the seas, but if perchance it goes upon the breakers, it is a complete wreck. On the contrary, a democracy is a raft where all the people may ride safely, though slowly, and with their feet constantly in the water. Our forefathers wisely adopted the idea of a raft as the pattern for our ship of state. We will progress slowly but surely if we keep to the standards of our fathers. Let it be our aim, as it was the aim of "our old mother beyond the seas," from whom we brought the ideals and traditions of Anglo-Saxon liberty, to be "a land of settled government of just and old renown, where freedom broadens slowly down from precedent to precedent."

#### THE UNSINKABLE SHIP OF STATE

Recent development in ship construction has produced a vessel with a large number of entirely separate water-tight compartments. Any one or two or three of these compartments may be broken into by the explosion of a torpedo or by ramming by another ship or by going upon the rocks, and still the ship will continue afloat and the lives of her passengers and her cargo be saved. So it is in this Republic, with this distribution of governmental power between 48 States. One, two, or more States may for a time be flooded by a sentiment which, if dominating the whole Nation, would result in national disaster. But only local harm would be done, and local recovery would be quick and the national safety and existence remain unimpaired. Again, our separation of powers between the Federal Government and the 48 State governments is analogous to the piers or pillars constituting the foundations of a house. If the same amount of brick and mortar distributed among the 48 pillars and at the various corners and along the several sides of a house were all concentrated in one large pillar under the center of the house even slight winds and earthquakes would topple the house over; but by the distribution of the stress and strain amongst 48 piers the house stands the stoutest storm and the severest quakes. When the fathers reserved to the States the vast multitude of powers relating to internal and domestic affairs they veritably builded this national house upon a rock. If we continue the original plan of structure, the storms may beat and the rains may descend but this house will stand.

#### BRITISH EMPIRE IS DECENTRALIZING

In the work entitled "The New Constitutions of Europe," by McBain and Rodgers, the question is discussed of the policy now beginning to prevail in large countries and empires, of decentralizing legislative and administrative functions so as to obtain greater efficiency, more satisfactory service, and more responsive attitude toward the needs, desires, and interests of the people. I quote, beginning at page 78:

As applied, however, to the United Kingdom itself, the agitation for federalism under the designation of "devolution" is by no means a dead issue. And the agitation rests not so much upon a demand for self-government among the units of the Kingdom as upon the practical necessity of bringing some measure of relief to an overburdened Parliament and Cabinet. The Parliament of the United Kingdom acts in four more or less distinct capacities: First, as a local legislature for the separate interests of England and Wales, of Scotland, and formerly of Ireland; second, as a national legislature for the interests of the United Kingdom as a whole; third, as an imperial legislature that is peculiarly responsible for the protectorates; and fourth, as the "single, sole, and sovereign authority finally responsible for the control and protection of the interests of the British Empire as a whole and in all its parts." In these several capacities the Parliament of the United Kingdom is responsible directly or indirectly for the peace, order, and good government of a quarter of the total population of the earth. The burden upon it has of recent years become almost intolerable. Imperial interests have grown in number and complexity. The internal, legislative, and administrative problems of most people of the British Isles, like the similar problems of most other peoples, have likewise become more numerous and more complicated. Merely because of the ever-increasing concentration of business many persons have thought that some measure of decentralization was not only desirable but also indispensable. To this end, and wholly apart from the unique and difficult Irish problem, proposals have been made for a devolution of some part of that created for England, Scotland, and Wales.

In October, 1919, the Prime Minister appointed a conference on devolution, which was presided over by the speaker of the House of Commons. This action was taken in response to a resolution passed by the House of Commons by a large vote on June 4, 1919.

It was resolved that, with a view to enabling the Imperial Parliament to devote more attention to the general interests of the United Kingdom and, in collaboration with other governments of the Empire, to matters of common imperial concern, this house is of opinion that the time has come for the creation of subordinate legislatures within the United Kingdom, and that to this end the Government, without prejudice to any proposals it may have to make with regard to Ireland, should forthwith appoint a parliamentary body to consider and report—

- (1) Upon a measure of federal devolution applicable to England, Scotland, and Ireland, defined in its general outlines by existing differences in law and administration between the three countries;
- (2) Upon the extent to which these differences are applicable to Welsh conditions and requirements; and
- (3) Upon the financial aspects and requirements of the measure.

In respect to the "devolution" of powers, which of course amounted to a division of powers between the British Parliament and the local legislatures, the proposals were substantially identical. The division would be somewhat different from that of any other federal system; but apart from the fact that it would be subject to alteration at the will of the central government, it would be none the less intrinsically federal in character.

On the local legislatures it was proposed to devolve powers over the following matters:

- (1) Internal commercial undertakings, professions, and societies (advertisements, amusement places and theaters, auctioneers, building societies, and loan societies, licensing (liquor), markets, and fairs);
- (2) order and good government (cruelty to animals, betting and gaming, charities and charitable trust acts, inebriates, police other than metropolitan police, poor law and vagrancy, prisons, reformatories);
- (3) ecclesiastical matters (burial law and matters affecting religious denominations);
- (4) agriculture and land (commons and inclosures, game laws, grainage, improvements, settled land acts, distress, and tenure);
- (5) judiciary and minor legal matters, coroners, county courts, minor criminal offenses procedure, definition, and punishment, law of inheritance, intestates estates, conveyancing and registration of land, minor torts, trustees, guardians, and wards);
- (6) education—primary, secondary, and university (except Oxford, Cambridge, and London);
- (7) local government and municipal undertakings (county council and municipal bills, fire brigades, local legislation—private bills, gas, water, and electricity undertakings—municipal government, including local franchises);
- (8) public health (preventive measures, contagious diseases, hospitals, housing, national health insurance, lunacy, and mental deficiency).

I introduce the following copious extracts from a recent publication entitled "Federal Centralization" by Prof. Walter Thompson of the faculty of Political Science, University of



Wisconsin. It is very gratifying to observe how keenly he perceives and how clearly he expresses the hazards and dangers of continuing the concentration of Federal power:

#### OTHER NATIONS DECENTRALIZING

But judging from recent developments throughout the world, one must note that the movement is not entirely toward centralization but that there is also, in many quarters, an earnest protest against this tendency and a plea for decentralization of legislative and administrative functions on the ground that the legislative area of the central government has become too large, and that consequently the General Government is not sufficiently in sympathy with local needs and desires. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVES LOCAL NEEDS

That there are distinct local interests which may serve to handicap the exercise of Federal control, irrespective of the constitutional questions involved, is lucidly pointed out by an English observer of American conditions as follows: "Yet even an observer handicapped, as I am, by an alien tradition, can not help but realize that there is in America a certain fundamental disunity of circumstances. When I am in Kansas, I know that I am not in New York. The problems, even the thoughts and the desires, are different and affect people differently. Is it wise to make Washington a kind of Hegelian harmonization of these differences and say that Congress can transcend them in a Federal statute? In the result, as every statesman must know, what are called the "interests of the Republic" in New York will probably be called "discrimination against the Middle West" in Kansas. And that is intelligible, even if it is rarely praiseworthy. For while action in Kansas would have attempted to cope with the difficulties of the Middle West, action at Washington aims—since a balance of interests must be struck—at their general evasion. Surely this suggests the existence of a problem which has aroused less attention than it deserves. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### NATION-WIDE LAWS IGNORE LOCAL CONDITIONS

There are also distinct sectional problems which in local public opinion, because of their proximity and applicability, appear even more important than general national interests. It is not to be expected that Wisconsin, where there is hope of assimilating most of the population, will have the same problems as Georgia, where a large proportion of the population is colored. Nor will a regulation which is applicable to Kansas, which is primarily agricultural, necessarily be applicable to Pennsylvania, which is largely urban and industrial. It is difficult to imagine any large State where local interests are more clearly marked than they are in the United States, and one reason for there not being such a protest against centralization in the United States as there has been in England and France may be that, whereas in England and France the agencies of local control have been reduced to impotence, in the United States there have been opportunities for an effective expression of regional opinion. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION

An alert public opinion is a dividend a democracy declares at the cost of efficiency. A more autocratic form of government where efficiency is the watchword is not adapted to the development of a vigilant public opinion. (Thompson on "Federal Centralization.")

The very alertness of public opinion in the United States may be a hindrance rather than a help to centralization of governmental functions. Most important questions vary in their application in different States. What is desirable in some is not acceptable in others. In national regulation there is always a danger of a relentless majority of the States imposing its will upon other States on a question that has not the same meaning in different localities. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### TYRANNY OF BOTH MAJORITY AND MINORITY

National control makes possible the tyranny of the majority, and if the control is established by constitutional amendment, it even makes possible the tyranny of the minority. It also imposes upon the national government the difficult task of enforcing the regulation in large areas which are not in sympathy with the legislation and where violation rather than enforcement is encouraged. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### STATE RIGHTS INSURES ADJUSTMENT TO GROWING NATION

The American people, especially in the West, are possessed of a pioneer spirit which manifests itself in attempts to try new things. The rapid growth of the country has demanded frequent readjustments. There has been a danger of the rapid economic transformation outstripping the formulation of such legislative policies as the exigencies demand. Consequently, in the last few years there has been much legislative experimentation, and by a process of trial and error the States are learning how to cope with new conditions. Such legislative experiments obviously would be inconvenient, if not frequently disastrous, if attempted on a national scale. But when conducted by the States the experience of one may be helpful to the others. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### GENERAL SAFETY AND PROGRESS INSURED

It is fortunate that the large number of Commonwealths in the American Union permits one State to experiment for the other 47. One State or another makes a new departure in the way of a minimum wage for women, abolition of private employment bureaus, "mothers' pensions," the "social evil," probation for adult first offenders, the juvenile court, municipal ownership, factory sanitation, the surgical sterilization of degenerates. Other States watch eagerly the results of the experiment and follow suit if the results are encouraging. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### THE UNSINKABLE SHIP

There is a great advantage in having different State governments trying different experiments in the enactment of laws and in governmental policies, so that a State less prone to accept novel and untried remedies may await their development by States more enterprising and more courageous. The end is that the diversity of opinion in State governments enforces a wise deliberation and creates a "locus penitentiae" which may constitute the salvation of the Republic. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### A SURE FOUNDATION FOR PROGRESS

Such an opportunity for experimentation makes it possible for the States to deal with contested and immature standards in legislation until a stabilized public opinion is formed. A State by experimenting may learn what to retain and what to eliminate. Other States can then accept the legislative policy and modify it to suit local conditions. This works for progress built on a sound foundation, and is one of the strongest and most practical vindications of our system of division of powers. (Thompson on "Federal centralization.")

#### CLAIMS OF HON. E. W. COLE TO A SEAT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an argument made by my constituent, E. W. Cole, claiming a seat in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an argument from a constituent on the Cole contested-election case.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman in favor of seating him?

Mr. BOX. The gentleman is my constituent, and has prepared a brief argument which I wish to insert.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it a long argument?

Mr. BOX. No; two typewritten pages, possibly three.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, Hon. E. W. Cole, who claims a right to a seat in this House as Representative at large from the State of Texas, has furnished me a copy of his argument in support of his contention that Texas is entitled to 19 Representatives in this body and that he should be seated. Mr. Cole, while now sojourning at Austin, the capital of Texas, where he fills the office of director of the State bureau of markets, has his permanent residence at Alto, Cherokee County, Tex., and is therefore my constituent. He is a man of high character. Since Mr. Cole gives evidence of a sincere conviction that he is entitled to a seat in this House and presents this argument on his own responsibility, desiring that it be inserted in the RECORD for examination and consideration of Members, it is only fair that they should read and consider it:

#### REASONS WHY THE STATE OF TEXAS IS ENTITLED TO 19 MEMBERS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND E. W. COLE SHOULD BE SEATED

Because—

The Constitution of the United States requires that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, agreeable to the census which shall be taken every 10 years. (See Constitution of the United States, Art. I, sec. 2; and Art. XIV, sec. 2.)

The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. (See Constitution of the United States, Art. VI, pt. 2.)

A State obtains its right to Representatives in the Congress from the Constitution of the United States, and not from any action or inaction of the Congress, the power of Congress, in this respect, being purely ministerial for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the Constitution. (See Constitution of the United States, Art. I, sec. 2; Art. XIV, sec. 2; and Art. VI, pts. 2 and 3.)

Members of the Congress, under their oath of office, are sworn to support the Constitution of the United States. (See Constitution of the United States, Art. VI, pt. 2.)

During the 1910 census decade the representative population of the United States was 93,403,151 persons, and the numerical membership of the House of Representatives was 435 Representatives; and the representative population of the State of Texas was 3,896,542 persons, and the number of Representatives from Texas in Congress was 18 Members.

But during this, the 1920 census decade, the representative population of the United States is 105,271,598 persons, and the numerical membership of the House of Representatives is still 435 Representatives; and the representative population of the State of Texas is 4,663,228 persons, and the number of Representatives from Texas certified by the Congress at the present time is only 18 Members. (See United States census reports for 1910 and 1920 and the Congressional Directory.)

The number 105,271,598, the representative population of the United States, being divided by the number 435, the numerical membership of the House of Representatives, gives a quotient of 242,003, which is the correct basis for the apportionment of Representatives in the Sixty-eighth Congress, and the number 4,663,228, the representative population of the State of Texas, being divided by the number 242,003, the present basis for the apportionment of Representatives in the Congress, gives a quotient of 19 plus a fraction of the basis. Thus it is clear that Texas is entitled to 19 instead of only 18 Representatives in the Sixty-eighth Congress. (Make the calculation and see for yourself.)

The people of the State of Texas have duly elected E. W. Cole, of Austin, Tex., as a Representative at Large, to fill the nineteenth place in the Texas delegation of the House of Representatives, and the Governor of the State of Texas has issued a certificate of election to the said E. W. Cole, and the said certificate of election was duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress. (See official records at Austin, Tex., and Washington, D. C.)

The first apportionment of Representatives among the several States was made directly by the Constitution itself, which at the same time directed that all subsequent apportionments shall be made according to the census which shall be taken every 10 years, and no Congress, except the Sixty-seventh Congress, has, in the history of the Nation covering a period of 120 years, failed to make an apportionment of Representatives every 10 years according to each decennial census, effective the third year of each census decade. (See Constitution of the United States, Art. I, sec. 2; and U. S. Stat. L., from 1790 to 1910, inclusive.)

To deprive E. W. Cole, the duly elected Representative at Large from the State of Texas, of membership in the House of Representatives of the Sixty-eighth Congress would be to deny the State its constitutional right and to abrogate Article I, section 2; Article XIV, section 2; and Article VI, parts 2 and 3, of the Constitution of the United States. (Read them again.)

If Congress has power to deny Texas or any other State Representatives to which it is entitled under the Constitution for two years, then by the exercise of the same power it could deny Texas or any other State its constitutional portion of Representatives for 200 or any number of years. Therefore it seems logical to conclude that if the Constitution does not require that Representatives be apportioned among the several States every 10 years, effective every 10 years, then it is evident that the founders of this Republic were mistaken as to the intent and purposes of the Constitution, and that all former Congresses were, in making all former apportionments, acting without a constitutional mandate, and that they could have lawfully refused to make any reapportionment since the adoption of the Constitution. Whereby in that event only 13 of the 48 States would now have Representatives in Congress, and they, the thirteen original States, could each have exactly and only the number of Representatives assigned by the Constitution—that is to say, New Hampshire, 3; Massachusetts, 8; Rhode Island, 1; Connecticut, 5; New York, 6; New Jersey, 4; Pennsylvania, 8; Delaware, 1; Maryland, 6; Virginia, 10; North Carolina, 5; South Carolina, 5; and Georgia, 3; making a total of 65 Members—and that the 35 States admitted to the Union since the adoption of the Constitution would therefore be without membership in the House of Representatives. (Read this again.) (See Constitution of the United States, Art. I, sec. 2.)

At the present time, based on the Constitution of the United States, the 1920 census, and the present numerical membership of the House of Representatives, 8 States of the Union are entitled to additional membership in the House, namely, California 3; Connecticut 1; Michigan 2; New Jersey 1; North Carolina 1; Ohio 2; Texas 1; and Washington 1; total, 12. And 11 States are enjoying membership in the House of Representatives to which they are not entitled, namely, Indiana 1; Iowa 1; Kansas 1; Kentucky 1; Louisiana 1; Maine 1; Mississippi 1; Missouri 2; Nebraska 1; Rhode Island 1; and Vermont 1; total, 12. (See United States census of 1920.)

If the States obtain their right to Representatives in the Congress from the Constitution of the United States, and not from the Congress which is a child of the Constitution, then any State would evidently be within its right to demand of the Congress its constitutional portion of Members in the House of Representatives, as in the case of Texas at this time, and certainly there could be no power, so long as the Constitution remains as it is now written, to deprive a State of any part of its full constitutional quota of Members in the House of Representatives without the consent of such State, except as pro-

vided by the Constitution wherein if any State shall disfranchise its lawful voters Representatives may be lawfully denied, but in the proportion only which the number of disfranchised voters shall bear to the whole number of lawful voters in such State. However, if any State should prefer to waive its right to its constitutional portion of Representatives in the Sixty-eighth or any other Congress, as in the case of some of the States at this time, such State could probably exercise that privilege. Furthermore, if any State has at this time more Representatives in the Sixty-eighth Congress than to which it is entitled under the Constitution, as in the case of some of the States, such State is, to that extent, enjoying a special privilege through the graces of the Congress, and not exercising a lawful right under the Constitution.

In addition to the constitutional provisions herein cited, which specifically provide that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers as shown by the census taken every 10 years, and precedents, in the form of regular apportionment acts of the Congress for the purpose of carrying out the expressed provisions of the Constitution, showing conclusively that heretofore all apportionments of Representatives have been made regularly every 10 years, the following precedents are cited wherein at different times, covering a period of 50 years, 13 Representatives have been added to the membership of 11 different States, namely, Alabama (twice), California, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee (twice), and Vermont, by special act of Congress when it was shown that these States were justly entitled to additional Representatives under the Constitution. These 13 cases are at point and have a special bearing at this time on the case of the State of Texas. (See United States Statutes, June 2, 1862, and May 30, 1872.)

This case has been established purely upon questions of law and fact and is not a partisan question. Therefore, I hope that it may be decided solely on the basis of justice and not from the standpoint of individuals' political fortunes or partisan politics.

E. W. COLE,

*Representative at Large Elect from the State of Texas.*

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7449. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6623. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Youngstown & Ashtabula Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio; and

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of William R. Bradley, former acting collector or internal revenue for South Carolina.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. SPROUL of Kansas, for eight days, on account of important business.

To Mr. EVANS of Montana (at the request of Mr. LEAVITT), for three days, on account of sickness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

422. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain disbursing officers, office of the superintendent State, War, and Navy Department Buildings, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3236. A bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.



Mr. KIESS: Committee on Printing. H. R. 7996. A bill to regulate and fix rates of wages for employees of the Government Printing Office; with an amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8236. A bill for the relief of the Government of Canada; with an amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. ROACH: Committee on War Claims. S. 946. A bill for the relief of the family of Lieut. Henry N. Fallon, retired; with amendments (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2656. A bill to permit the correction of the general account of Robert G. Hilton, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6049. A bill for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 47. A bill to permit the correction of the general account of Charles B. Strecker, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Committee on Claims. S. 210. A bill for the relief of Peter C. Keegan and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. S. 661. A bill for the relief of Charles Hurst; with amendments (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7694) to facilitate commerce by prescribing overtime rates to be paid by transportation lines for inspection of arriving passengers and crews, and the same was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8330) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, store, and sell wheat, and to secure and maintain to the producer a reasonable price for wheat and to the consumer a reasonable price for bread, and to stabilize wheat values; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8331) to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8332) to improve and assist in maintaining the park now established at the Prairie Grove battle field in Washington County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 8333) to restore homestead rights in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 8334) reaffirming the use of the ether for radio communication or otherwise to be the inalienable possession of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 8335) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in anthracite coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8336) to amend section 25 (a) of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8337) to amend sections 1605 and 1606 of the Compiled Laws of Alaska, to permit corporations authorized by law to administer estates of deceased persons to be appointed executors or administrators thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) to provide for designating the route of the Old Oregon Trail; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233) to amend an act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) admitting Frederick Vester to the rights and privileges of a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Resolution (H. Res. 241) for the consideration of H. R. 5478, for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECK: A bill (H. R. 8338) granting a pension to Luren M. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 8339) for the relief of Mary Loy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 8340) granting a pension to Jane Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8341) granting an increase of pension to Casandra Booher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8342) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Triplett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 8343) for the relief of Jim Hennessee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 8344) granting an increase of pension to Clara Wirtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 8345) granting a pension to John McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWOOPE: A bill (H. R. 8346) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Kresge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 8347) granting an increase of pension to Minnie E. Crow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8348) granting an increase of pension to George Sheffield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8349) granting an increase of pension to Martha Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2092. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Societa Italiana di Mutuo Soccorso, Duca Degli Abruzzi, of Lymanville, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2093. By Mr. BOYCE: Petition of Hebrews of Wilmington, Del., opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2094. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Boston & Maine Railroad Federated Shop Crafts, requesting that railroad strike be settled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2095. By Mr. DEAL: Petition of Norfolk (Va.) Branch, National Woman's Party, urging Congress to pass equal-rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2096. By Mr. FULLER: Petitions of the Association of Drainage and Levee Districts of Illinois and sundry citizens, opposing bills to authorize a greater diversion of water from Lake Michigan for sanitary or water-power purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2097. Also, petition of the rural letter carriers of Winnebago County, Ill., praying for an allowance for upkeep of a vehicle of 6 cents a mile per day be provided by law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2098. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Genoa, Ill., opposing the Sterling-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

2099. Also, petition of the Boone County (Ill.) Farm Bureau, favoring the McNary-Haugen bill (H. R. 5563); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2100. Also, petition of the National Council, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, favoring the Johnson immigration bill (H. R. 6540); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2101. By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Petition of Service Star Legion, Utah Division, favoring participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2102. Also, petition of the Salt Lake City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Salt Lake City, Utah, urging that the United States send representatives to the forthcoming international conference on narcotics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2103. By Mr. MAGEE of New York: Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., and vicinity, for repeal of excise taxes on motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2104. By Mr. MAGEE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Carpenters' District Council; Raymond W. Milner Post, 415, V. F. W.; directors of South Hills Trust Co.; Bloomfield Trust Co.; Homewood Peoples Bank; and Vesle Post, 418, F. V. W., all of Pittsburgh, Pa., indorsing increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2105. Also, petitions of Fraternal Order of Eagles, No. 76; Misteleski Davidson Post, 204, V. F. W.; Oakland Board of Trade; Carrick Bank; All Nations Deposit Bank; Knoxville Lodge, 1196, B. P. O. E.; B. B. Brashear Lodge, 1024, I. O. O. F.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Local 86; Golden Rule Council, No. 93, F. P. A.; directors Congress of Women's Clubs; Klinkner Post, 331, V. F. W.; Ricketts Massloff Post, 747,

V. F. W.; Dicresco Parsons Post, 843, V. F. W.; Press Club; Lodge 46, L. O. O. M.; U. W. W. O., fifteenth ward; Rod and Gun Club; and Iron & Glass Dollar Savings Bank, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., indorsing increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2106. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Mrs. Myra Griswold, on behalf of the Minnesota Women's Christian Temperance Union, urging the defeat of any bill which would legalize the sale of beverages containing more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2107. By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of members of the Garibaldi Club, of Providence, R. I., opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2108. Also, petition of members of the Societa Italiana di Mutuo Soccorso, of Lymanville, R. I., opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2109. By Mr. SMITH: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Emmett, Idaho, protesting against the legalization of 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2110. Also, petition of South Boise Women's Christian Temperance Union, Boise, Idaho, protesting against the legalizing of 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2111. Also, petition of Womans' Christian Union and Loyal Temperance Legion, of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, protesting against any amendment of the prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.